# CLARK'S

## FOREIGN

# THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XV.

**Keil on the Books of Kings.**

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET;
LONDON: J. GLADDING; WARD AND CO.; AND JACKSON AND WALFORD.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLVII.

# COMMENTARY

ON

# THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

BY

KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, D.D. PH.D.

PROFESSOR OF EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY AND THE ORIENTAL LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DORPAT.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MURPHY, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, BELFAST.

SUPPLEMENTED BY

## COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

BY

ERNST BERTHEAU,

PROFESSOR IN GOETTINGEN.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MARTIN, B.A.,

EDINBURGH.

VOLUME I.



EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON, AND HODGES AND SMITH.

MDCCCLVII.

PRINTED BY
ROBERT PARK,
DUNDEE.

# PREFATORY NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

A separate Commentary on the Books of Kings has been much wanted in the English language. This want has now for the first time been supplied in a very able manner by the following work. Its author has devoted much of his time and attention to the elucidation of the Old Testament, and he is one of the safest of German commentators. His apologetischer Versuch über die Chronik, Berlin, 1833, was a very important contribution towards this object, and prepared the way for the present treatise, which appeared in 1846. The author has since issued a Commentary on the Book of Joshua, which appears in the series of the Foreign Theological Library for this year. An Introduction to the Old Testament also came from his pen in the year 1853. The present work, as well as all the others, is distinguished by a sober, judicious, and careful investigation of the meaning of the text, a large and well-selected array of solid information, and a firm attachment to evangelical doctrine. The reader may not accord with his opinions or conclusions on every point; but he cannot fail to reap much benefit from his well-directed labours, and to acknowledge his valuable aid in the study of this important portion of Holy Scripture.

The translator has only to express his hope that the meaning of the author has been throughout correctly and plainly conveyed to the English reader.

# CONTENTS.

## INTRODUCTION.


| | Page |
|---|---|
| § 1. Name, contents, scope, and character of the Books of Kings, | 1 |
| § 2. Age and Author of the Books of Kings, | 8 |
| § 3. Of the sources and credibility of the Books of Kings, | 13 |
| § 4. Exegetical helps, | 21 |


## SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF SOLOMON.


| | |
|---|---|
| Chapter I.—Solomon anointed King, | 23 |
| Chapter II.—Last charges of David and his death, vv. 1-11. Confirmation of the Sovereignty of Solomon, vv. 12-46, | 41 |
| Chapter III.—Solomon's marriage and worship of God, vv. 1-3; his solemn prayer and offering at Gibeon, vv. 4-15; and his wise decision of a case in law, vv. 16-28, | 57 |
| Chapter IV.—List of Solomon's most distinguished officers of court and state, | 63 |
| Chapter V.—Solomon's might, glory, and wisdom, vv. 1-14. His league with Hiram, vv. 15-32, | 76 |
| Vv. 15-32. Preparations for the building of the Temple, | 85 |
| Chapter VI.—The Building of the Temple, | 92 |
| Chapter VII.—Building of the Royal Palace, vv. 1-12, and making of the Temple furniture, vv. 13-50, | 114 |
| Chapter VIII.—The dedication of the Temple, | 137 |
| Chapter IX.—The happy answer to Solomon's prayer, vv. 1-9; closing notices of his Buildings, vv. 10-25; and of his Navy, vv- 26-28, | 157 |
| Chapter X.—Visit of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem, vv. 1-13. Solomon's riches, vv. 14-29, | 168 |
| Chapter XI.—Solomon's polygamy and idolatry, vv. 1-13; his adversaries, vv. 14-40; his death, vv. 41-43, | 182 |


## SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE SEPARATED KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH TILL THE FALL OF THE FORMER.


| | |
|---|---|
| Chapter XII.—Revolt of the Ten Tribes from the House of David, vv. 1-24, comp. 2 Chr. x.—xi. 4; Foundation of the Kingdom of Israel, vv. 25-33, | 209 |

Page

CHAPTER XIII.—Prophecy against the calf-worship introduced by Jeroboam, 223

CHAPTER XIV. 1-20.—Prophecy against the House of Jeroboam and the Kingdom of Israel, vv. 1-18. Jeroboam's death, vv. 19, 20, . . 234

CHAPTER XIV. 21-31.—Reign of Rehoboam of Judah. Comp. 2 Chr. xi. 5—xii. 16, . . . . . . . . . . . 239

CHAPTER XV. 1-31.—Reigns of the Kings Abijam and Asa of Judah, vv. 1-24, and of Nadab of Israel, vv. 25-32, . : . . 249

CHAPTER XV. 32—XVI. 28.—Reigns of Baasha, xv. 32—xvi. 7; Elah, vv. 8-14; Zimri, vv. 15-22; and Omri, vv. 23-28, Kings of Israel, . 255

CHAPTER XVII.—First appearance of Elijah, . . . . . . 262

CHAPTER XVIII.—Elijah's interview with Ahab, and contest with the Prophets of Baal, . . . . . . . . . . 274

CHAPTER XIX.—Elijah's flight from Jezebel and journey to Horeb, . . 287

CHAPTER XX.—Ahab's victory over Benhadad, . . . . . 300

CHAPTER XXI.—Seizure of the vineyard of Naboth and his shameful execution by Ahab, . . . . . . . . . . . 310

CHAPTER XXII.—War renewed with the Syrians, and Ahab's death, vv. 1-40. Reign of Jehoshaphat in Judah, vv. 41-51, and of Ahaziah King of Israel, vv. 52-54, . . . . . . . 316

## SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.

CHAPTER I.—Ahaziah's sickness and death, . . . . . . . 331

CHAPTER II.—Ascension of Elijah, vv. 1-18, and the first miraculous doings of Elisha, vv. 19-24, . . . . . . . . . 338

CHAPTER III.—Jehoram, King of Israel, vv. 1-3; his expedition against the Moabites in conjunction with Jehoshaphat, vv. 4-27, . . 355

CHAPTERS IV.-VIII.—Miraculous works of Elisha, . . . . . 364

CHAPTER IV.—Elisha miraculously multiplies the Widow's oil, vv. 1-7; promises the Shunammite a son, and raises the child from the dead, vv. 8-37; makes noxious food wholesome, vv. 38-41; and feeds many with a little, vv. 42-44, . . . . . . . . . 370

CHAPTER V.—Healing of the Syrian Leper Naaman, vv. 1-19; and punishment of Gehazi with leprosy, vv. 20-27, . . . . . 380

CHAPTER VI., vv. 1-23.—Elisha makes iron swim, vv. 1-7; and smites the Syrians with blindness, vv. 8-23, . . . . . . 388

CHAPTER VI. 24—VII. 20.—Elisha announces, during a famine in Samaria, the sudden occurrence of great cheapness, . . . . . 396

CHAPTER VIII.—Elisha's reputation aids the Shunammite in gaining her rights from the King, vv. 1-6. In Damascus Elisha announces the kingdom to Hazael, vv. 7-15. Reign of the Jewish King Jehoram, vv. 16-24, and that of Ahaziah, vv. 25-29, . . . . . 405

CHAPTER IX.—Jehu is anointed King by Elisha, vv. 1-10; conspires against Joram, vv. 11-16; and slays Joram King of Israel, Ahaziah King of Judah, and Queen Jezebel, vv. 17-37, . . . . 413

CHAPTER X. vv. 1-27.—Extirpation of the remaining sons of Ahab, vv. 1-11; of the brethren of Ahaziah of Judah, vv. 12-14; and of the Prophets and Priests of Baal, vv. 15-27, . . . . . . . . 420

CHAPTER X. vv. 30-36.—Reign of Jehu of Israel, . . . . . 429

CHAPTER XI.—Athaliah usurps the throne, vv. 1-3, but is overthrown and Joash raised to the throne, vv. 4-20. Comp. 2 Chr. xxii. 10, xxiii. 21, 430

CHAPTER XII.—Reign of Joash King of Judah, and repair of the Temple, 441

# INTRODUCTION.

## § 1. NAME, CONTENTS, SCOPE AND CHARACTER OF THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

The Books of Kings formed originally only one book סֵפֶר מְלָכִים. Even to the times of Origen and Jerome the Hebrew manuscripts contained them as an uninterrupted and continuous work; comp. Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* vi. 25, and Jerome in the *prol. galeat.* The separation of them into two books is due to the LXX. and the Vulgate, where they are named *βασιλειῶν τρίτη καὶ τετάρτη* (third and fourth Book of Kings), *Regum* iii. *et* iv., and was first introduced into the Hebrew editions also by Dan. Bomberg. The work bears the name Book of Kings from its contents, as it narrates the history of the Israelitish Kings from Solomon to the dissolution of the kingdom at the Babylonish captivity. The history of these Kings forms not merely the chronological thread, which runs through the whole work, but also the chief contents of the books, from which they with justice derive their name, and the principle of division for the three periods, into which the history of these times divides itself. The first period embraces the forty years' government of Solomon, in which the theocracy was raised to the summit of its external and internal power, and from which towards the end of Solomon's reign it began again to decline. Solomon's departure from the Lord drew after it the departure of the ten tribes from the royal family of David; and the second period extends over the whole time of the separate contemporary kingdoms of Israel and Judah, from 975 to 722 B.C., containing in three epochs the history of both kingdoms till the overthrow of the first: see Comment. Lastly, the third period includes the his-

tory of the remaining kingdom of Judah till its overthrow, and the Babylonish captivity, from 722 till about 560 B.C.—Still the author did not intend to give a mere political history of the Kings. It cannot escape the attentive reader, that, as Gesenius has properly remarked in his Comm. on Isai. i. p. 934, "the narrative of the activity of the prophets in the state and of their miracles forms a leading topic of this book." Fr. Kern in Bengel's new Archives of Theol. ii. 2, p. 469 ff. has entered into a more exact investigation of "what is properly positive in the composition of the books of Kings, and of the relation between what is given and what is omitted of the historical books, to which the author refers;" and has endeavoured to prove by a complete induction, that the basis of the work is the very definite design, "to present the history of the Israelito-Jewish Kings in relation with the claims, acts, announcements, and predictions of the prophets from Solomon to the Babylonish captivity." Accordingly Hävernick (Hdb. d. hist. krit. Einl. in d. A.T. ii. 1, p. 146) and de Wette (Lehrb. d. hist. krit. Einl. in d. A.T. § 183 of 5th ed.) designate the general tendency of these books as "prophetico-didactic," with which the whole plan and structure of the work corresponds, "which designs by no means to give a mere external political or internal religious and ecclesiastical view, but has applied itself with the most decided preference to the delineation of the prophetic in relation to the kingly office, so that the view given penetrates as deeply into the whole life and conduct of the prophets as of the Kings and people." (Häv. in passage quoted.) But though these views of the scope and character of our books contain much truth, yet the fundamental idea, which guided the author in his extracts from the larger historical works so often quoted by him, is neither clearly apprehended nor duly appreciated. The author did not follow a prophetico-didactic tendency as opposed to a purely historical aim in the selection and elaboration of his materials; nor is the line of Kings only "the external thread, by which the main subject is arranged in chronological order, and which thereby forms rather the formal than the material unity of the whole." (Häv. p. 150.) But the history of the Kings forms the kernel and centre of the whole work, the representation as well of the duration and spirit of their

government, as of those of their acts which had most influence on the progress of the theocracy; to which the narrative of the activity of the prophets neither runs externally parallel nor occupies a superior or inferior place, but into which it is admitted as a spiritual element of life, which pervaded the theocracy during this period. As invisible but actual King of the theocracy the Lord had prepared the prophets as the organs of his will, who represented his law and right over against the earthly kings, and were to stand beside these, counselling and guiding or reproving and warning, and, when necessary, to prove their messages to be the words of God by signs and wonders before the people. As long, therefore, as theocratically-minded sovereigns occupy the throne, we see the prophets active only in giving aid and counsel in difficult positions of the theocracy, whereas under the untheocratic reigns they display their whole Divine authority, and, as the messengers of God, oppose the Kings with such power and effect, that these behove to bow before them or underlie their sentences. Our author therefore makes the activity of the prophets a chief point of his history, not in consequence of a prophetico-didactic tendency, but because he wrote the history of the theocracy in times in which the activity of the prophets exercised so important an influence upon it. If he had wished to subordinate the history of the Kings to that of the prophets, he would certainly, to name only one of a number of facts, not have given so comparatively full an account of the reign of Solomon, of the wisdom, the many buildings, the trade, the revenues, and the riches of this monarch. Or had he, as Häv. p. 147 thinks, because he had so little remarkable to relate in the history of the later Kings, been unable to resist giving in the commencement of his work a few details of the glory and splendour of Solomon, and lingering a while to gaze in admiration on the scene, yet the description would not have been so regularly arranged and carried out, as it actually has been and is shown to have been in the Commentary.

The author has in general followed no principle proper to himself or peculiar, but simply and only endeavoured to represent the progressive development of the theocracy during the period described by him according to the principle which the Lord has laid down in the promise made to King David in 2 Sam. vii.

12—16: "And when thy days be fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established for ever." This glorious promise forms the golden thread, which runs through the whole history of the Kings from Solomon to the Babylonish exile; it forms the leading idea in the representation of this history in the books before us. How the Lord fulfilled this gracious word, how he first chastised, then banished, yet not for ever, the seed of David on account of their transgressions, this the author designs to explain in the history of the Kings. Setting out from this point of view he shows in the history of the reign of Solomon, how Solomon, notwithstanding the attempted usurpation of the throne by Adonijah, received the whole kingdom of his father, as the seed of David chosen and confirmed in his sovereignty by the Lord, and how the Lord in the very beginning of his reign renewed at Gibeon the promise made to his father on condition of sincere obedience to his commands, and at his entreaty gave him not only a wise and understanding heart, but also riches and honour, so that his like was not to be found among all the kings of the earth, 1 Ki. i. 1, v. 14; how Solomon then accomplished the work of building the temple, which was committed to him by his father according to the will of the Lord, and the Lord after its completion again assured him of the fulfilment of that promise, v. 15, ix. 9; lastly, how Solomon, after he had arrived at the highest earthly glory by the completion of all his remaining buildings, by the great fame of his wisdom reaching even to distant nations, and by his great riches, acquired partly by navigation and trade, partly by tribute and presents, forgot his God, who had promised and bestowed all this glory, and in his old age allowed himself to be seduced by his many foreign wives into apostasy from the Lord, and therefore behoved to hear the sentence of God

"Forasmuch as thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee and will give it to thy servant. Notwithstanding, in thy days I will not do it, for David thy father's sake: I will rend it out of the hand of thy son. Howbeit, I will not rend away all the kingdom, I will give one tribe to thy son for David my servant's sake and for Jerusalem's sake, which I have chosen," ix. 10, xi. 13. The reference to the promise 2 Sam. vii. lies clearly at the root of this penal sentence of God. Because God promised to the seed of David perpetual possession of the throne, therefore a part of the kingdom, including the chosen city Jerusalem, is to remain with the son of Solomon, and only the sovereignty of ten tribes is to be given to his servant (Jeroboam, ix. 26—40.) The historical accomplishment of this sentence forms the contents of the second period, in which the ten tribes form a distinct kingdom beside the kingdom of Judah, which remains to the descendants of Solomon.

In this period certainly the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes is treated with comparatively greater fulness than that of the kingdom of Judah, but only because it presented more material for the theocratic historian than the latter. For as the ten tribes arbitrarily effected the separation from the royal house of David announced of God by his prophets; as Jeroboam their appointed king, by the introduction of the unlawful worship of the calves, made the political separation an occasion of apostasy from the Lord and his consecrated sanctuary; as all his successors on the throne continued these sins of Jeroboam; lastly, as the dynasty of the house of Omri aggravated this apostasy still more by the elevation of the Phœnician Baal-worship to be the predominant state religion; so the Lord behoved by his servants the prophets to hold up ever anew before the apostates his law and their sin, and to give power and force by miracles to the word of his servants against the stiff-necked transgressors, in order that the perverse might have no excuse for their sin, and their final banishment from his presence might appear to be the just penalty of their unmitigated obduracy. But here, because the activity of the prophets was so important, the historical record of it must occupy a larger space. Comp. also the remarks in the Com. 1 Ki. xvi. 29–34.—Much less violent was the combat

of the theocratic principle, defended by the prophets in Israel, with the untheocratic proceedings of the Kings of Judah. These, as the legitimate successors of the royal house of David, did not all certainly walk in the commandments and statutes of the Lord as their ancestor David; but their declension could not so easily and rapidly shake and undermine the theocratic foundations, which the kingdom and people had in the Levitical priesthood and the legally constituted temple worship at Jerusalem. By means of this spiritual power pervading the whole life of the state and the people, even the kings were ever brought back again to the law and testimony of the Lord, so that after individual back-sliding sovereigns others theocratically disposed followed, who zealously laboured to fulfil the Divine law and establish it in the kingdom. The history of the kingdom of Judah had therefore a much more peaceful course, and the Lord has less occasion here than in the kingdom of Israel to guide its development by the interference of his extraordinary messengers the prophets. It could therefore in general be comprised in a much narrower space. Where, on the other hand, events important for the progress of the theocracy occurred in Judah, the narrator dwells on these as long as on the important events of the kingdom of Israel. (Comp. 2 Ki. xi., xii., xvi.) But even if here and there it appears as if the history of the kingdom of the ten tribes overshadowed that of Judah, by which appearance Eichhorn (Einl. in. d. A.T. iii., p. 542 cf.) was betrayed into the ungrounded assertion, that the history of the kingdom of Judah was only introduced on account of the synchronism, this appearance vanishes on closer inspection, and it is seen that the author treats both kingdoms with equal justice, because he points out how the Lord testified to both in like manner and endured both with much long-suffering and mercy. But according to the different relation of both kingdoms to the Lord this exposition also behoved to be differently arranged. When the sovereignty of the ten tribes was announced to Jeroboam, he had received the promise, on the condition of perfect obedience to the commands of God, that the Lord would be with him to build him a sure house, as he had done for David, and would give Israel unto him (1 Ki. xi. 37 f.) Thus the possession of the sovereignty over Israel was promised to him for his posterity, as long as this

kingdom should endure: for it was not to endure for ever; the separation was again to cease; for which reason the perpetual endurance of the kingdom was not ensured to him (1 Ki. xi. 38.) But Jeroboam was as far from fulfilling this condition as any of his successors on the throne of Israel. Nevertheless the Lord had patience with the kings and tribes who were disobedient to his laws, and not only warned them by his prophets from the beginning to the end of the kingdom, and chastised the whole kingdom by threatening as well as by executing the threatened judgments on several kings and dynasties, or even by enemies, but also repeatedly renewed his grace to them on account of his covenant with Abraham (2 Ki. xiii. 22) in order to move them to repentance until the period of respite had elapsed, when the kingdom was overthrown and the ten tribes were carried away to Assyria and Media.—In the kingdom of Judah the succession for ever was promised to the house of David; the Lord, therefore, chastised the backsliding certainly by hostile invasions, but still for His servant David's sake caused a light to shine for the royal house, so that He did not punish the idolatrous kings of Judah with the extirpation of their race (1 Ki. xv. 4; 2 Ki. viii. 19), and even when the godless Athaliah destroyed all the royal seed, preserved Joash, the infant son of Ahaziah, and soon raised him to the throne of his father (2 Ki. xi.) But because this kingdom possessed in the uninterrupted succession of the royal race of David as firm a political as it had a strong spiritual ground in the chosen city of Jerusalem, with its temple consecrated of the Lord himself as the place for the revelation of His name, it was enabled to survive the kingdom of the ten tribes for a long period. After Ahaz had by his ungodliness brought it to the brink of destruction, it received in Hezekiah a king, who did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah altogether as his father David had done, and in the great distress of Judah through the mighty army of the proud Sennacherib took refuge with the Lord, who at his entreaty protected and delivered Jerusalem for his own sake and that of his servant David (2 Ki. xix. 34, xx. 6.) But when at length, through the long reign of the idolatrous Manasseh, apostasy and moral corruption had become so predominant in Judah, that even the pious Josiah withhis zealously pursued

religious reformation was only able to suppress the external worship of idols, but could effect no real conversion of the people to the Lord their God, and the Lord, as the Holy One of Israel, behoved to pronounce the decree of the rejection of Judah from his sight on account of the sins of Manasseh, and to carry it into execution by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Ki. xxiii. 26 f., xxiv. 3 f.), Jehoiachin was certainly carried captive to Babylon, and under Zedekiah the kingdom was destroyed by the burning of Jerusalem and the temple. Yet the Lord did not utterly quench the light of His servant David, but Jehoiachin, after he had languished thirty-seven years in prison at Babylon, suffering for his own and his father's sins, was released from his prison by the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and raised again to honour, as Evil-merodach set his seat above the seat of the kings that were with him in Babylon, and caused him to eat all his life at his own table. The narrative of this agreeable turn in the captivity of Jehoiachin, with which our books close, is so essential to the plan of our author, that without this communication his work would want its right conclusion. For this event casts on the dark night of the exile the first ray of a better future, which was to break forth for the seed of David, and through them for the whole people in their future deliverance from Babylon, and secured for them the certain fulfilment of the promise, that the Lord will not for ever withdraw his grace from the seed of David.

## § 2. AGE AND AUTHOR OF THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

It admits of no doubt that the Books of Kings were composed by one author at one and the same time.[1] The internal unity of

[1] The unity of these books with those of Samuel, which was asserted by Eichhorn (Einl. iii. p. 560 ff.), Jahn (Einl. ii. 1, p. 232 f.), de Wette (Beitr. i., p. 43), and J. G. Herbst (Einl. ii. p. 139 f.), has been long since given up again by de Wette himself (Einl. § 186), and amply disproved by others, for example Hävern. (Einl. ii., 1, p. 142 f.) and Welte (in Herbst's Einl. ii. p. 142 ff.); while on the other hand the latest advocate of this opinion, C. H. Graf, in his shallow rationalistic *Dissertat. de librorum Samuelis et Regum compositione, scriptoribus, fide historica, imprimis de rerum a Samuele gestarum auctoritate.*

the work appears as distinctly from the construction of the whole according to a fixed and consistently carried out principle (comp. § 1), as from the similarity of style and language. From beginning to end the author quotes written sources, and marks carefully the chronologies of the leading events. Besides, certain standing formulae occur again and again throughout the entire work. Thus the commencement and close of each reign, the description of its spirit, the death and burial of the kings, is throughout expressed and described in the same phrases and words; and not only is exact reference made to the law, and the relation of the sovereigns to it, but this reference is rendered more emphatic by express allusion to the Mosaic law.[1] In the language also of our books, along with a considerable diversity, occasioned by the sources employed, we cannot fail to observe a great pervading unity; from the beginning to the end of the work the influence of the later speech usage is apparent.[2] This

*Argentor*. 1840, has not advanced a single new argument of any importance.

[1] For the most of the above-mentioned points, the citation of the proof-passages would be superfluous, as they must of themselves strike the eye of every attentive reader of our books. With respect to the references to the law of Moses, comp. 1 Ki. ii. 3, vi. 12 f., ix. 4, xi. 33 f.; 2 Ki. x. 31, xi. 12, xiv. 6, xvii. 13, 15, 19, 34, 37, xviii. 6, xxii. 8 ff., xxiii. 21, &c.

[2] Thus the remark made by Stähelin in Tholuck's litt. Anz. 1838 p. 526, and in the "Krit. Untersuchungen ü. d. Pent. Jos., Richt., Sam., u. der Könige Berlin," p. 135, that the first two chaps. of our books are connected in language with the books of Samuel, as the Cherethi and Pelethi mentioned several times in the 2d Book of Samuel are found only in 1 Ki. i. 38, and only in these two chapters occur פדה נפש, 1 Ki. i. 29, as in 2 Sa. iv. 9; מריא, 1 Ki. l. 9, 19, 25, as in 2 Sa. vi. 13; מלט נפש, 1 Ki. i. 12, 1 Sa. xix. 11, 2 Sa. xix. 6, is explained by the unity of the sources of these chapters with those of the books of Samuel, and by no means proves, as de Wette, Einl. p. 242, believes, that these chapters were originally connected with the 2nd Book of Samuel. Among the peculiarities of usage to be explained by the diversity of the sources is certainly also to be included the frequent occurrence of Aramaising suffixes in 2 Ki. iv., from which Eichhorn and others draw the unfounded conclusion, that this passage proceeds from another author than that of the remaining parts of our books. See in Comm. p. 355, note. Peculiarities of later speech-usage are *words;* as בֶּדֶק, 2 Ki. xii. 6 ff., xxii. 5; דָּיֵק, 2 Ki. xxv. 1; כֹּר for חֹמֶר, 1 Ki. v. 2, 25; מְדִינוֹת, 1 Ki. xx. 14 ff; פֶּחָה, 1 Ki. x. 15,

pervading unity of matter, language, and style, is acknowledged even by de Wette, when he declares (Einl. § 184): "nowhere is clearly seen the insertion or collocation of different narratives;" and what this sceptical critic notwithstanding professes to have discovered as exceptions to this statement, have been already met by Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 169), and are also obviated further in the Comm.

If we enquire concerning the time of the composition of this work, it is so far ascertained, that it cannot have been before the second year of the reign of Evilmerodach, to which the narrative is extended, but at all events some time after this date. It has been thought, certainly, that, as it is stated that Jehoiachin obtained sustenance for life from Evilmerodach, and mention is only made of Evilmerodach as King of Babylon, Jehoiachin must have died before Evilmerodach, and our author have written under or soon after Evilmerodach (Häv. p. 170.) But this reasoning is by no means conclusive. Our author might find it sufficient for his purpose, merely to mention the end of Jehoiachin's incarceration and his elevation from the state of a captive, and to close his work with this happy turn of the captivity of the seed of David, without referring to the Babylonish kings following Evilmerodach, and without taking into consideration whether Jehoiachin died before or after Evilmerodach. This only can be determined with certainty, that the composition of our books was completed before the end of the captivity. For this happy event would not have been left unmentioned by the author, if he had written after its occurrence, as it quite suited his purpose, since it afforded the most splendid evidence, that God certainly chas-

xx. 24, 2 Ki. xviii. 24; קָבָל, 2 Ki. xv. 10; רַב, 2 Ki. xxv. 6, &c.; *word-forms*, as צִדֹנִין, 1 Ki. xi. 33; רָצִין, 2 Ki. xi. 13; סֵבִיב, 2 Ki. viii. 21; בְהִשְׁתַּחֲוָיָתִי, 2 Ki. v. 18; מִשֶּׁלָּנוּ, 2 Ki. vi. 11; בַּהַשָּׂדֶה, 2 Ki. vii. 12; אוֹתוֹ for אִתּוֹ, 2 Ki. i. 15, iii. 11 f., viii. 8; אוֹתָם for אִתָּם, 2 Ki. vi. 16, &c. Comp. here also the collection of later peculiarities by Stähelin, Krit. Unters. p. 150, in which, however, some things are erroneously noted, for example, חָפְשִׁית, 2 Ki. xv. 5, in the unfounded sense of "sickness," הִתְמַכֵּר לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרַע, 1 Ki. xxi. 20, 25, 2 Ki. xvii. 17, and several others.

3

tised, but did not entirely reject the seed of David on account of their sins. With this view agree also the later peculiarities of diction in our books. The other grounds of de Wette derived from the spirit of the book, as "the constant reference to the law of Moses, the disapprobation of the offerings on the high places, the rigid prophetic pragmatism, the gloomy view of the history and the legends and exaggerations," rest partly on erroneous dogmatic presuppositions and partly on peculiar esthetic opinions, which can be of no importance in criticism.

From the time of composition it has been attempted to determine the author of our book. Following the guidance of certain old theologians (see Carpzov's Introd. 1, 242 sq.) Hävernick i. p.q. p. 171 thought he could show with the highest historical probability, that Jeremiah was the author of our work. Setting out from the Talmudic notice in *Baba bathra fol.* 15, 1; ירמיה כתב ספרו וספר מלכים וקינות he finds this not to be despised testimony of the old Jewish opinion supported by internal grounds. Besides the surprising affinity of the whole linguistic character of our book with the writings of Jeremiah, there appears on closer inspection a still more intimate alliance in the same gloomy view of the history, so that especially in 2 Ki. xvii. 11 ff. we think we hear the prophet speaking; in certain favourite ideas of both works, as that of the choice and perpetuity of the house of David, and of the choice of Jerusalem; in the like propensity for borrowing phrases from the Pentateuch, and in the exact reference to earlier prophecies and their careful use, here for the history, there for the prophecy. To this is added the relation of 2 Ki. xxiv. 18 ff. to Jer. lii., which can only be explained by both sections coming from the hand of Jeremiah. Now as this passage from the very beginning belongs altogether to the manner of the author of the Books of Kings, this can be no other than the prophet Jeremiah. These considerations include all that can be said for this view; but still they are deficient in convincing power. For to begin with the last point, to which Hävernick himself attaches most importance, the generally verbal correspondence of 2 Ki. xxiv. 18—xxv. 30, with Jer. lii., cannot be explained by Jeremiah having composed both accounts, the one for the Books of Kings, the other as an appendix to the collection of his prophecies. On the other hand these parallel

sections are, as will be shown on 2 Ki. xxiv. 18, abstracts made independently of each other from a common larger source, of which Jeremiah cannot at all be the author, because the latest events of that section occurred at least seventy years after his entrance on the prophetic office. And besides the difference of the two accounts in matter, on which compare the Commentary, several variations in style speak against its composition by Jeremiah, as הֶהָמוֹן 2 Ki. xxv. 11 for הָאָמוֹן Jer. lii. 15; דַּלַּת הָאָרֶץ 2 Ki. xxv. 12 for דַּלּוֹת הָאָרֶץ Jer. lii. 16, comp. v. 15, whereas דַּלַּת ה׳ occurs Jer. xl. 7, and וַיְדַבְּרוּ אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּט 2 Ki. xxv. 6 for וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ מִשְׁפָּטִים Jer. lii. 9, as Jeremiah always writes, comp. i. 16. iv. 12, xxxix. 5. If therefore the last section of our work was not composed by Jeremiah, of course the whole work cannot have proceeded from his hand; and in reality the affinity asserted by Hävernick in the remainder is not so close as to prove the identity of authorship in both. The reference to earlier prophecies peculiarly characterising Jeremiah, which A. Küper has so luminously pointed out in *Jeremias librorum ss. interpres atque vindex. Berol.* 1837, is quite a different thing from the historical proof given in our books, that the sayings of the prophets were exactly fulfilled. The borrowing of phrases from the Pentateuch, for example 2 Ki. xxiii. 26, and Jer. iv. 8, comp. with Deut. xiii. 18, is common to the writers during and after the captivity. How closely, for instance, Ezekiel and Zechariah follow the Pentateuch in thoughts and words! And does not the prophetic language of all the prophets rest more or less on the Pentateuch? Farther, if Jeremiah, as well as the author of our work, gives prominence to the idea of the choice of the house of David, and of Jerusalem (comp. 1 Ki. ii. 4, viii. 25, ix. 5, with Jer. xxxiii. 17, xiii. 13, xvii. 25, xxii. 4), the prophet only agrees in this with the history recorded in the annals of the kingdom of Judah, which our author has extracted, whereas other verbal agreements, as 2 Ki. xvii. 14 with Jer. vii. 26, the phrase only occurring 2 Ki. xvii. 15, and Jer. ii. 5 וַיֵּלְכוּ אַחֲרֵי הַהֶבֶל וַיֶּהְבָּלוּ and other examples collected by Küper and Hävernick, are sufficiently explained by the acquaintance of our author with the prophecies of Jeremiah and his making use of them. After the statement therefore of the common

and kindred thoughts, phrases, and words in the prophecies of Jeremiah and the Books of Kings, Küper has with perfect correctness remarked: *ex solis ejusmodi consensus vestigiis audacius foret, si quis prophetæ partes in conscribendis libris historicis derivaret* (l.c. p. 57.) Lastly, if Hävernick contends still in favour of his view, that "in the age in which it was written no other man is known so competent in every respect to the task as Jeremiah," it follows from this, that we cannot name the author, but certainly not that no suitably qualified prophet then lived. And our difficulty of finding another author among the known prophets of that time can no more than the complaints in Ps. lxxiv. 9, and Lam. ii. 9, of the deficiency of prophets then existing, move us to ascribe the composition of our work on insufficient grounds to Jeremiah, since that difficulty is set aside by a simple *non liquet*, and this complaint, according to the correct explanation of Clauss, Beitr. 3. Krit. u. exeg. der Ps. p. 406 expresses only "the defect of consolatory prophets, who, amidst the imminent disorder and alarm, might have pointed out to the anxious a present help and a not distant term of their calamity, and thereby afforded an immediate relief."

## § 3. OF THE SOURCES AND CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

As the Books of Kings record the history of the theocracy from 1016 to 562 B.C., and thus include a space of more than 450 years, the author living at the end of this time can only have prepared his accounts of the greatest part of the period described by him from older sources. Concerning these sources, also, he leaves the reader in no uncertainty. At the close of the history of Solomon's reign he refers to the סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה (1 Ki. xi. 41), then for every king of Judah to the סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה (1 Ki. xiv. 29, xv. 7, 23, xxii. 46; 2 Ki. viii. 23, xii. 20, &c.), and for every king of Israel to the סֵפֶר ד׳ הי׳ לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Ki. xiv. 19, xv. 31, xvi. 5, 14, 20, 27, xxii. 39; 2 Ki. i. 18, x. 34, &c.), in which more may be found concerning the history, the particular acts, buildings, &c., of the

several kings. And there cannot be a doubt that the ספר דברי שְׁלֹמֹה was a public chronicle of the reign of Solomon, and the ספר ד׳ הי׳ למלכי ישראל and ספר ד׳ הי׳ למלכי יהודה were public annals of the two kingdoms. To this points in the latter the correspondence of the title with that of the public annals of the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, which are called Esth. x. 2 סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי מָדַי וּפָרָס. To this assumption, that our author drew the materials of his history from public annals of the kingdom, objection has certainly been made by Bertholdt (Einl. iii. p. 947 ff.), de Wette (Einl. p. 240), and various others: but if we disregard the several hypotheses and assertions of Bertholdt, so far as they have been given up as untenable by later critics (see the refutation of them by Hävern. i. p. q. p. 154 ff.), the objections are reduced to the following point: "The time in which the author wrote, and the legendary nature of several narratives, preclude the assumption, that the sources cited could be the official annals of the kingdoms" (de Wette.) But the supposed legendary nature of several narratives, to which, according to the more definite statement of Stähelin i. p. q. p. 152 ff., as well the miraculous deeds as the definite and exactly fulfilled predictions of the prophets are referred, rests merely on the unproved rationalistic presumption, that miracles and predictions are impossible and therefore unreal. This argument is nothing more than an uncritical prejudgment, to which only dogmatic partiality can attach any importance in criticism. The time in which our author wrote might still speak very strongly against the actual use of the annals of the kingdoms cited by him, if we understand by the "official annals of the kingdoms" the state archives of the two realms, of which it is altogether probable, although not proved, that they perished with these kingdoms. Identifying, therefore, the royal annals with the state archives, Movers declares (Krit. Untersuchungen ü. d. bibl. Chronik. Bonn 1834 p. 185 f.), that our author certainly cites constantly the annals of the kingdoms, but makes use of them not immediately, but only mediately in extracts, as appears from the following passage: "they must proceed originally neither from himself nor from the contemporary annalists of the kingdom, but from a historian who wrote earlier than the one and later than the other." To this opinion, also, B. Welte

in Herbst's Einl. ii. p. 155 f. accedes, only with the modification that he first assumes that the author of our books, besides the source mentioned by Movers, the Sepher Melachim composed from the annals of the kingdom, employed also the annals of the kingdom themselves, and therefore regards only the former of the two passages cited by Movers for his opinion, 1 Ki. viii. 8 and xii. 19, as demonstrative, as Hävern. p. 159 had already satisfactorily shown of the other, that the remark contained in it "unto this day" proceeds from the author of our books. Now if this passage actually contain the proof derived from it, we should certainly have reason to say farther with Welte, that the use of other sources, perhaps derived at an earlier period from the annals of the kingdom, along with these should not be denied, merely because the author names no such source, and the original sources themselves were at his command. "For if he wished to refer to a historical work, where the full details of a circumstance summarily stated were to be found, he might fairly name only the annals of the kingdom, and omit another more abridged work, that he perhaps also employed. On the contrary such a work, if it ever existed, could not be indifferent to him, and he must have had frequent occasion to have recourse to it, even if it were only for the lightening of his labour." But the first question is, whether the existence of such a historical work beside the annals of the kingdom be demonstrable. In order to answer this question, we must first form a clear conception of these annals of the kingdom. Were they nothing else than the notices recorded by the מַזְכִּירִים, officially appointed by the kings, of the reigns, acts, and undertakings of these sovereigns? In this case they could not possibly be composed in one spirit and according to the theocratic principle throughout, because, even with regard to the kingdom of Judah, not all the kings were theocratically disposed, and the godless rulers would not have suffered their acts to be judged according to the standard of the law, and entered accordingly in the public annals of the kingdom. But if we look wholly to the kingdom of Israel, there is no evidence whatever that these kings had public annalists of the kingdom, whose office it was to write the chronological history of their reigns. But even if we were to presuppose this as certain, yet of the proceedings of the prophets

who so vigorously opposed the kings and idolatrous priests, especially of an Elijah or an Elisha, these Israelitish annalists of the kingdom would have introduced into their annals at most only such sayings and doings as concerned the kingdom, certainly not their whole ministry, least of all the miracles they wrought on private individuals, and their whole agencies in the schools of the prophets. Thus, if we assume such official annals as the source of our author, we must on the one hand regard the theocratic principle pervading his abstract as his own, whereby, having marked out for the reader in his abstract the right point of view from which to regard the history, he could always direct those who wished to learn more of the several doings of the kings to these annals. On the other hand we must assume that he drew his full accounts of the ministry of the prophets partly at least from other sources, and did not specially quote these, merely because he had adopted everything important out of them into his work. Farther, as these annals are designated a סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיּ׳, we must also assume, that they were continued without interruption from the time of the origin of both kingdoms in Israel to the end of the reign of Pekah, and in Judah to the death of Jehoiakim, when they are cited for the last time (comp. 2 Ki. xv. 31, and xxiv. 5), so that they formed in each kingdom a "book of the Chronicles of the Kings" and, as Hävern., p. 151 expresses it, lay before our author in an already complete form. The annals of the reign of Solomon, however, must have formed a separate and independent work under the title ספר דברי שְׁלֹמֹה, closing with the death of that monarch. If we regard our Books of Kings by themselves, there is no fundamental objection to this view of the sources cited in them. It is fully sufficient, not only for the explanation of the citations, but also for the vindication of the credibility of our books, while the composition of these annals, according to a fixed theocratic principle, neither presumes nor demands any alteration of the historical material deposited in the sources. The passage also urged by Movers and Welte finds its complete solution in this view. For even, if neither our author after the destruction of the temple, nor a contemporary annalist, could make the remark, that the staves of the ark of the covenant were there (that is, in the most holy place) unto this day, yet the annalist, who

after the death of Solomon concluded the annals of his reign, might very well add this remark, in order to show, that the appointment of Moses, that the staves should not be taken out of the rings of the ark of the covenant (Ex. xxv. 15) was observed. Thus this passage also proves nothing for the existence of a source different from the annals of the kingdom.

But if we compare the Books of Chronicles, and the written sources therein cited, with our books and their citations, the view hitherto unfolded of the royal annals proves itself to be untenable. For the chronicler, although he has for the most part used the same sources as the author of our books,[1] yet cites *(a)* for the history of Solomon, "the words of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the vision of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat" (2 Chr. ix. 29), and *(b)* for the history of the kingdom of Judah, besides a greater historical work, entitled[2] the book of the kings of Judah and Israel, in several reigns, also various prophetical writings,

[1] The proof of this see in my apologet. Versuch ü. d. BB. d. Chronik. Berl. 1833, p. 199 ff. The contrary hypothesis of Movers, that the writer of Chronicles has drawn the sections, which he has in common with the books of Samuel and Kings, from these canonical books, Hävern. Einl. ii. 1 p. 195 ff. has already opposed. Welte also, i. p. q. p. 188 f., after stating and examining the grounds asserted for this hypothesis, comes to the conclusion, that he cannot regard them as satisfactory. He certainly at the same time finds the grounds for our position unsatisfactory, and remarks: "Since the writer of Chronicles must have been acquainted with the Books of Kings, because they were extant long before his time, and paid attention to earlier historical works bearing on his subject, as his references to such prove, some use of them is antecedently at least highly probable. For the Books of Kings must have been to the chronicler, if they were ever known to him, a very welcome means of lightening his labour, which he could not possibly allow to lie beside him unregarded." But the probability of this assertion is not quite so evident. For since the author of Chronicles has manifestly used the full annals as sources, and since, as any careful comparison shows, see for example in the Comm. p. 70, 138, &c., even in the parallel sections he follows throughout his own plan without concerning himself with the apparent contradictions, into which his work, constructed on other principles, repeatedly falls with the narrative of the Books of Kings, he must certainly have allowed these books to lie by him unregarded, because he considered their use much more an aggravation than an alleviation of his labour.

[2] The title of this work is variously given, now סֵפֶר מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, (2 Chr. xxv. 26, xxviii. 26, xxxii. 32), now ס׳ מ׳ יש׳

which must not only have stood in the closest connection with the book of the kings of Judah and Israel, and the book of the chronicles of the kings cited in our work, but two of which, according to his own express statement, were adopted into the book of the kings of Israel and Judah, that is, into the annals of the kingdoms. Comp. 2 Chr. xx. 34, and xxxii. 32; Kleinert, die Echth. des Jes. i. p. 51; Hävern. i. p. q. p. 198 and Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 25. Hence it becomes clear, that the annals used and quoted by our author were composed, if not wholly, yet in great part, by the prophet. The ספר דברי שלמה must have had on the whole the same contents as the three prophetical writings cited by the author of Chronicles, and can only have consisted of these, because thus only is explained the great agreement of Chronicles with our books in the history of Solomon; comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 251. The annals also of the kings of Israel and Judah must have been a work of the prophets, first on the ground that, according to the before cited passages, whole prophetical writings were adopted into them, and next because the chronicler, even where he cites only prophetical writings, as for example in the history of Rehoboam, (comp. 2 Chr. xii. 2—11, with 1 Ki. xiv. 25—28), agrees with our Books of Kings as

ס׳ הַמְּלָכִים וִיהוּדָה, (2 Chr. xxvii. 7, xxxv. 27, xxxvi. 8), now ס׳ מַלְכֵי יְשְׂרָאֵל לִיהוּדָה וִיש׳, (2 Chr. xvi. 11), now ס׳ מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, (2 Chr. xx. 34), or דִּבְרֵי מַלְכֵי יש׳, (2 Chr. xxxiii. 18), or even מִדְרַשׁ סֵפֶר הַמְּלָכִים (2 Chr. xxiv. 27.) For that all these citations are only variations in the title of one and the same work, and that the annals of the kings of Israel and Judah cited the Books of Kings, which the author of the Books of Kings used separate, and the author of Chronicles united into one book, as I have endeavoured to show in my apol. Vers. p. 252 ff., of all this I am still fully convinced. Neither the objections of the anonymous writer in Tholuck's litt. Anz. 1835, Nov. 71 ff., nor the strictures of Welte i. p. q. p. 195 f., nor the grounds on which Hävern. i. p. q. p. 193 ff. endeavours to prove this to be a historical work constructed after the annals of the kingdoms have been able to shake this conviction. For how far the biblical writers vary in the designation of one and the same work is manifest enough from the fact that the state annals of the Medes and Persians are named in Esther x. 2 סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי מָדַי וּפָרָס, but in vi. 1, סֵפֶר הַזִּכְרֹנוֹת דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים, lastly, in the Chaldaic part of the Book of Ezra iv. 15 only סְפַר דָּכְרָנַיָּא.

verbally as where he refers to the book of the Kings of Judah and Israel; comp. my. apol. Vers. p. 257. But if this be established, then these annals were not the official chronicles of the two kingdoms which the מַזְכִּירִים appointed by the kings had recorded, but historical works in the form of annals, which were composed by the prophets and under their influence. This assumption, based upon the distinct testimony of the writer of Chronicles, is also the only one that corresponds with the theocratic character of the history. From the great importance which the history of the covenant-people, exhibited according to the spirit of the theocracy, had, not merely for the present, but also for the future, the prophets, who in their prophecies and addresses held forth to the people not only the law as a rule and direction, but also the history of the past frequently as the mirror and example of their life, must have reckoned the composition of the theocratic history among the duties of the call given to them by the Lord, and composed accordingly the history of their time by noting down public annals, in which, without respect of persons, the life and conduct of the Kings were judged and exhibited according to the standard of the revealed law.[1] These annals may very well be regarded as a work continued with the history of the times, exhibiting the whole period of a reign without interruption, as during this whole interval prophets were never wanting either in Israel or Judah, of whom the later always might and did continue the labour of the foregoing, so that, according to this view of the public annals, it is not necessary to assume, that the several historical writings of the prophets contemporary with the events should be collected and reduced into a larger historical work in the form of annals at a later period, but shortly before or during or immediately after the close of the reign. Especially against this assumption is the circumstance, that the writer of Chronicles in some reigns cites as sources only special prophetical writings, in others only the royal annals, and in others again the royal annals, together with sundry prophetical writings. For if this history in the shape of annals were

[1] Thus the prophet Isaiah wrote the history of the reign of Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 22), and the prophet Iddo composed a מִדְרָשׁ of the reign of Abijah (2 Chr. xiii. 22.)

first at an after period put together, partly from the historical writings, partly from the sayings and predictions of the prophets intermingled with history, no valid ground can be conceived why the editor of this large work admitted only some of these works wholly, others not at all into his work, and made partial extracts from others, so that the chronicler thought it necessary to refer at one time only to the prophetical writings instead of the annals, at another time to the latter along with the former, as writings in which more is to be found concerning the history of which he has given only an abstract. This proceeding is only explained on the supposition, that the gradually formed annals of the kings were composed by various prophets living and acting contemporaneously, and not only beside but independently of these other prophets, noted the most important proceedings of the prophets in separate writings, which were handed down to posterity along with the annals. In this case it is easy to conceive how the chronicler, who employed both kinds of writings for his work, might find it to his purpose to refer in different reigns according to the nature of the written sources before him, now to the annals, now to sundry prophetical writings, now to both at the same time.

Now if an authentic representation of the history might be expected from the author of our work according to the view first given of the royal annals, we may cherish this expectation with still greater confidence according to the view now presented of his sources. For in the latter case he prepared his work from public annals composed by the prophets, the credibility of which is fully guaranteed by the position which these men of God occupied in the theocracy. The conscientious use of these sources for the composition of a true and reliable history, we may unhesitatingly infer from the circumstance, that his contemporaries, to whom the annals employed by him were so easily accessible, that he could constantly refer the reader of his book to them, thought his work worth preserving, while they allowed the annals gradually to perish. This inference is fully justified also by the contents of our books. With a candour regardless of consequences, and with entire impartiality, the life and conduct of the kings are judged according to the standard of the divine law. Thus, for example, the idolatry of the celebrated

King Solomon, into which he allowed himself to be betrayed in his old age by his many foreign wives, is as little unnoticed as that which was right in the sight of God, when performed by the sovereigns of the ten tribes who revolted from the royal house of David. The weak-minded despondency of even the greatest of prophets Elijah, in face of the empty threats of Jezebel, is as openly recorded as his bold encounter with Ahab and the prophets of Baal in the strength of the Lord. Our books breathe throughout the spirit of the purest truth, the chastest morals, the genuine piety of the old covenant; a spirit, which precludes even the possibility of garbling the history. The historical character of our work is also on the whole pretty generally recognised. In the latest edition of his introduction, even De Wette has fallen away from his former assertion, that our author furnished rather a didactic poem than a historical work, and speaks only of many myths and exaggerations, as well as traditions, which his work contains along with genuine historical and credible accounts and living sketches. But how imperfectly this opinion is supported, and how it rests altogether on dogmatic presumptions, and labours under internal contradictions, has been already convincingly shown by Hävernick (Einl. ii. 1, § 170), so that we have no need to dwell longer on this point at present, as the several objections will be considered and disposed of in the Commentary.

## § 4. EXEGETICAL HELPS.

EPHRAEM *Syri* (Deacon at Edessa, † 378) ܦܘܫܩܐ *explanatio in I. et II. regnorum libr.*, in the first volume of his Syriac works, Rome 1737. *fol.*

THEODORETI (bishop of Cyrus on the Euphrates, † 457 or 458) *quæstiones in libr. III. et IV. regnorum*, in the first vol. of his works, published by Schulze and Nösselt. Halle. 1769. 8.

PROCOPII *Gazaei* (in the 6th cent.) *in libros Regum et Paralip. scholia, ed. Jo. Meursius. Lugd. Bat.* 1620. 4. These scholia are a mere abstract from Theodoret's quæstions.

The *Commentarii in libros Regum III. et IV.*, in the *Max. biblioth. vet. Patr. tom. VI., p.* 965 *sqq.*, which are falsely ascribed to *Eucherius*, bishop of Lyons (434—454), contain only allegorical and didactic remarks on several passages of the books of Kings without exegetical value.

R. SAL. JARCHI (רש״י in the 12th cent.) *comment. Heb. in libr. Jos. Judic., Ruth, Sam., Regum etc., lat. vers. a Jo. Fr. Breithaupto. Goth.* 1714. 4.

The commentaries of *Nic. Serarius in libr. Jos., Jud., Ruth, Regum et Paralip. Mog.* 1609. 2 *voll. fol.*, and *Franc. de Mendoza in libr. Regum. Col.* 1634 *fol.*, as also *Seb. Leonardi ὑπομνήματα in libr. Regum, Lips.* 1610, were not at my command.

CORN. A LAPIDE (Jesuit, † 1637) *Commentar. in Jos., Jud., Ruth, IV. libr. Regum etc., tom. II. Antw.* 1718. *fol. Annotata ad libr. I. et II. Regum* by *Seb. Münster, Franc. Vatablus, Isidor. Clarius, Jo. Drusius* and *Hugo Grotius* in the 2d vol. of the *Critici Sacri. Frcf.* 1695 *fol.*

*Synopsis criticorum etc. adorn. a Matth. Polo. Frcf.* 1894. *Vol. I.* 4.

SEBAST. SCHMIDT *in libros Regum annotationes. Argentor* 1697. 4.

JO. CLERICI, *Veteris Test. libri historici etc. ed. nov. Tub.* 1733 *fol.*

AUG. CALMET, Commentaire literal sur le iii. et iv. livre des Rois. Paris 1711. 4.

J. DAV. MICHAELIS, Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte [Remarks for the unlearned] in his German translation of the Old T. Part xii. Gött. 1783. 4.

JO. CHRIST. FRID. SCHULZII *scholia in Vet. Test. Vol. III. Norimb.* 1785. 8.

Exegetisches Handbuch [Exeg. Manual] of the Old T. 9th Part (containing the second book of Kings) Lpz. 1800. 8.

THADD. ANTON. DERESER, Anmerkungen [Remarks] on the Holy Scripture of the Old T. edited by Dom. v. Brentano and himself. Part ii., vol. 2. Frkf. 1801. 8.

Commentarius grammat. critic. in Vet. Test. Scripsit Franc. Jos. Val. Dominic. Maurer. Vol. i. Lps. 1835. 8.

# FIRST SECTION.

---

### HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF SOLOMON.

The history of Solomon's reign begins by stating how Solomon obtained the throne and established his dominion, ch. i.—ii. Then follows the account of his government, how God hearing his prayer bestowed on him more wisdom, riches, and glory, than all other kings, ch. iii.—x. The chief and central point of this account consists of the tolerably full description of the buildings of Solomon, by which his reign was so much distinguished, ch. v. 15—ix. 28. The close contains the narrative of his fall towards the end of his life and of his death, ch. xi.

## CHAPTER I.

### SOLOMON ANOINTED KING.

During the lifetime of David, Solomon is named as his successor, and anointed king. Occasion was given for this proceeding by Adonijah, an elder son of David, who, taking advantage of the weakness and impotence of his aged father, attempts to usurp the throne, vv. 1—10. His treasonable plan, however, is discovered through the vigilance of the prophet Nathan, and frustrated by the efforts of Nathan and Bathsheba, as David being made acquainted with it by them, immediately orders the anointing of Solomon, and causes it to be effected, vv. 11—40. When Adonijah learns this, he flees to the altar, and, on condition of peaceable behaviour, obtains forgiveness from Solomon, vv. 41—53.

Vv. 1—4. When David became so old and weak that he could not keep himself warm, his servants advise him to recruit his vital powers by means of a young virgin lying beside him. The fair Abishag of Shunem is therefore chosen to be his companion. The narrating of this apparently trifling circumstance belongs to the pragmatism of the history. Older expositors have rightly remarked that the history of the fair Abishag is here introduced, not on her own account, but on that of Adonijah, as he afterwards forfeited his life by asking her to wife. V. 1. וְהַמֶּלֶךְ. By the *cop.* ו the following narrative is not merely connected in general with the prior history, as Maurer remarks with reference to Jos. i. 1; for there we have וַיְהִי, which certainly *narrationem annectit quasi superiorum temporum historiis, quarum imago scriptoris menti obversabatur,* and is employed in later writings as the standing formula of the historic style in the beginning of a book even without definite reference to a foregoing narrative, for example, Ezek. i. 1; Esth. i. 1; 1 Maccab. i. 1; *καὶ ἐγένετο.* The simple ו *and* in the beginning of a writing, however, since even the Hebrews do not begin their books with *and,* (Ewald, Krit. Gramm., p. 546, Not. 7), is a sure sign that it was originally connected with another, as Ezr. i. 1, comp. my apol. Vers. üb. d. Chron., p. 91 f. As our Books of Kings, however, neither form nor ever have formed one book with those of Samuel, this ו in the beginning can only be explained in this way, that our author received and retained it verbally from his source, in which it was attached to the preceding, in order to distinguish his work from the very first as a continuation of the Books of Samuel. בָּא בַּיָּמִים, always connected with זָקֵן, corresponds to our "stricken in years," denoting the advanced period of life, Gen. xviii. 11, xxiv. 1, Jos. xiii. 1, xxiii. 1. As David became king in his 30th year, and reigned forty years, (2 Sam. v. 4, 5), he must now have been in his 70th year. בְּגָדִים, not garments, but *stragula,* Num. iv. 6—13, bed-clothes, 1 Sam. xix. 13. וְלֹא יִחַם לוֹ *impers.* there was not heat to him. יִחַם for יֵחַם from חָמַם, see Ewald Krit. Gr. p. 466. (*Winero* יִחַם *est fut. K. a* יחם, *sed praesens* יָחַם *ad eandem radicem referri, cujus est* חַם *vs.* 2, *cf.* חַם *et* יֵחַם *in eodem contextu. Maur.*) V. 2. The means

suggested to David by his servants is one recommended by the testimony of physicians.[1] Coverings and garments can only preserve and accumulate the heat actually existing in the body, but not supply that which is gone. This can, as *Procopius Gaz.* has remarked, only take place by the communication of the living warmth of another body, when by immediate contact the living power is transferred from the strong to the weak body.[2] נַעֲרָה בְתוּלָה *puella virgo, i.e. illibata,* comp. Deut. xxii. 23—28, Judg. xix. 24, xxi. 12.—בתולה is the *term. techn.* to denote the *virgo illibata,* as *a virorum consortio separata,* not only in Hebrew, but also in Arabic and Aramaic, comp. *Genesii thes.* i. 250. עָמַד לִפְנֵי denotes the standing of the servant before his master, to receive his commands and directions, and therefore to serve, attend, see v. 4, Deut. i. 28, comp. with Ex. xxiv. 13; 1 Ki. x. 8, &c.—סֹכֶנֶת nurse, properly *utilitatem procurans, familiaris commoditatum administra (Schulz.)* The significations מחממת *calefaciens* (Jarchi), קְרִיבָא *propinqua* (Chald.), *θάλπουσα* (LXX.), *foveat* (Vulg.) are only conjectured from the connection. Neither does the word signify *amica (Wineri Lex.),* for סֹכֵן Is. xxii. 15, is not like רֵעַ הַמֶּלֶךְ 1 Ki. iv. 5; 1 Chro. xxvii. 33, as Gesen. on Is. xxii. 15 affirms, but denotes the officer who manages the king's household, comp. Hitzig on the place. The sing. suff. in לאדני is explained by the circumstance, that only one of the עבדים spoke.—V. 3 הַשּׁוּנַמִּית from the town of Shunem belonging to the tribe of Issachar (Jos. xix.

[1] *Nullum salubrius consilium excogitari potuit, quam quod servi ejus ceperunt, quærentes virgunculam formosam, quæ in sinu ejus dormiret videbanturque legisse* Galenum *libr.* 7 *methodi, ubi imbecillitatem frigidi cum siccitate ventris curans, inquit:* Ex iis vero, quæ extrinsecus applicantur, boni habitus puellus una sit accubans, ut semper abdomen ejus contingat. *Multo itaque melius illi consuluerunt, quam si eum magna vestium mole onerassent, aut multo igne lectum concalefecissent, aut involvissent senem totum linteis igne concalefactis, aut oleis calidis inunxissent,—quia nullus calor naturali nostro magis conformis aut esse aut excogitari potest, quam qui fervet in puerili aut adolescentulæ corpore: nimirum humanus ille est et ob ætatem vigens. Fr. Valesius de Sacr. Philos. c.* xxix., *p.* 187 *ed.* vii.

[2] The Emperor Frederic Barbarossa was advised by his physician to let a young and strong boy lie against his stomach, comp. Reinhard, Bibelkrankh. des A. T. (1767) p. 171.

18; 1 Sam. xviii. 4; 2 Ki. iv. 8.) Shunem (שׁוּנֵם) lay on the table land of Esdraelon, according to Eusebius and Jerome, who write the name *Σουλήμ*, five Roman miles south of Tabor, see v. Raumer, Palest. 2 ed. p. 137, at present a small dirty village of the name of Solam, c. Robinson, Pal. iii. p. 402 f.—V. 4. The controversy of the older theologians, whether the fair Abishag was the consort *(uxor)* of David or not (s. *Pfeiffer dub. vex. p.* 406. *seqq.*) rests upon a misconception of the relations of that time. Abishag was certainly regarded as David's concubine, although the impotent king neither knew her, nor indeed took her to himself from carnal lust. And as polygamy was not forbidden, but permitted, if not even favoured by the law of Moses (see Michaelis Mos. Recht ii. § 94—96), neither did the addition of such a maiden give offence, nor did David sin, as some have asserted, in taking her for medical reasons.

Vv. 5—7. Adonijah the son of Haggith took advantage of the weakness of his aged father to raise himself to the throne. הִתְנַשֵּׂא to exalt oneself, Prov. xxx. 32. In his sinful vanity he probably believed, that the throne belonged to him of right. He was the fourth son of David (2 Sam. iii. 4; 1 Chro. iii. 2), and now indeed the oldest of those still living, as Amnon was long since murdered by Absalom (2 Sam. xiii. 29), Absalom likewise was slain in his rebellion (2 Sam. xviii. 14), and Chileab (2 Sam. iii. 2, or Daniel, 1 Chr. iii. 1) was probably also dead, because no more mention is made of him, so that according to the right of primogeniture prevalent among all nations[1] he laid claim to the succession. But in Israel the Lord, the invisible King of the theocracy, had reserved to himself the choice, as soon as the people should desire a king (Deut. xvii. 14 ff.), and exercised this right not only in the cases of Saul and David, but also in that of Solomon. He had not only imparted to David the promise of the perpetual sovereignty of his seed (2 Sam. vii. 12—16) but also designated the man of peace (Solomon) as the one, who after his death should build the temple (1 Chr. xxii. 9, 10,

[1] *Herodotus* vii. 2: *ὅτι νομιζόμενα εἴη πρὸς πάντων ἀνθρώπων, τὸν πρεσβύτατον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχειν.* *Justinus l.* ii. 10. *Artamenes maximus natu, ætatis privilegio regnum sibi vindicabat; quod jus et ordo nascendi et natura ipsa gentibus dedit.* Comp. also Paulsen, die Regierung der Morgenl. i. p. 43 ff.

xxviii. 5 f.), and showed Himself gracious to Solomon from his birth, wherefore Nathan gave him the name Jedidiah (Jehovah's favourite) "because of the Lord" (2 Sam. xii. 24 f.) In this favour to Solomon David had the Divine assurance, that his conduct with Bathsheba, after it was punished by the death of the first child, was entirely forgiven. Certain of the Divine will, he could therefore with all right give to Bathsheba assurance on oath (vv. 13, 30), that her son Solomon should be his successor on the throne; an assurance which was also well known to Nathan the prophet, for which reason he, as guardian of the rights of God,—but not as "the wise leader of a court cabal," as Köster die Proph. d. A. u. N. T., p. 65, fancies,—declared himself against Adonijah's usurpation and defeated it (v. 11 ff.). Even to Adonijah, according to v. 12 (comp. ii. 15), the designation of Solomon as successor was not unknown.[1] But he trod in the very footsteps of his elder brother Absalom, like him (2 Sam. xv. 1) he provided for himself a court establishment, chariots, horsemen, and fifty footmen, in order to commend himself to the people as the successor to the throne, and David, in weak indulgence, allowed him to have his way, because he did not wish to vex or displease him (עִצְּבוֹ).—מִיָּמָיו is explained by the Rabbins, Jarchi, Levi, Kimchi, J. D. Michaelis, and others; *per totam vitam ejus, i.e., unquam.* This is against the context, which requires מִיָּמָיו to be understood of the time of commencing his ambitious movements, as Seb. Schmidt and J. H. Michaelis have rightly observed. The words: "and he also was a very goodly man," point likewise to the great similarity of Adonijah to Absalom, see 2 Sam. xiv. 25. The beauty of each served to attract the people to him. For the Hebrews looked to the personal beauty of their kings (1 Sam. ix. 2; Ezek. xxviii. 12) no less than other nations of antiquity, who made

[1] Mich. in Mos. R. i. § 60 incorrectly derives from this passage the conclusion, that "The Israelitish kingdom was certainly hereditary, not however according to the right of primogeniture, but so that the father could designate whomsoever of his sons he thought most worthy as his successor." For the succession depended not on the free will or discretion of the father, as even Winer bibl. R.W. i. p. 787 still thinks, but on the will of the Lord, who either immediately revealed it or tacitly indicated it by the fact of primogeniture.

beauty of form so much a leading requisite of the sovereign, that Xenophon (*Conviv.*) says: *μαίνεσθαι δὲ μὴ τοὺς καλοὺς στρατηγοὺς αἱρουμένους*, because, as *Max. Tyr. diss.* 9 says, they thought: *ὅτ' ἔστι σωμάτων ὥρα οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ μελλούσης ἀρετῆς ἄνθος, καὶ οἱονεὶ προοίμιον κάλλους ὡραιοτέρου*, see *J. Dougtæi anal. ss.* (1693) i. 131, where still more passages of the ancients are to be found, which commend the beauty of the ruler.—"And she bare him after Absalom," the son of Maachah, 1 Chr. iii. 2. That Adonijah was next to Absalom, the oldest son of David, appeared to give him a claim on the throne. To יָלְדָה is wanting the subject, his mother Haggith, v. 5, because it can easily be supplied from the sense, comp. Ew. Heb. Gr. § 551 (third ed.)—V. 7. וַיִּהְיוּ דְבָרָיו וגו' *consilia sua secum communicabant*, see *Gesen. thes.* i. 316.—Joab, who as commander-in-chief formerly did so great service to David, attached himself to the pretender Adonijah, because he had long since quarrelled with David, comp. ii. 5, 6. But how the high priest Abiathar, who before proved so true to David, was now beguiled into treachery we know not. The assertion of Jarchi on this passage, that Abiathar was at this time removed from the high priesthood, because the Urim and Thummim gave no answer to David, is proved by 2 Sam. xv. 35 to be a Rabbinic conceit. עָזַר אַחַר in a pregnant sense, to help one so that men immediately follow him.

V. 8. Zadok of the race of Eleazar, who is designated as הַכֹּהֵן several times with Abiathar, and of equal rank with him, 2 Sam. viii. 17, xv. 24, 29, 35; 1 Chr. xviii. 16, was not, as the older theologians supposed, second priest כֹּהֵן מִשְׁנֶה, 2 Ki. xxv. 18; who, as representative in cases of hindrance, undertook the functions belonging exclusively to the first or high priest כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ, comp. *Selden de succ. in pontiff*, i. 4; but high priest in the tabernacle of testimony at Gibeon, 1 Chr. xvi. 39, xxi. 29; whereas Abiathar officiated as high priest at the ark of the covenant since Eli's death removed from the tabernacle of testimony to Zion, comp. Hävernick, Einl. ins. A. T. i. 2, p. 566, 573 f. Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, the fifth among David's mighty men (2 Sam. xxiii. 20—23), of priestly descent, and head of the family of Aaron (1 Chr. xxvii. 5), was under David first captain

of the body guard (2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 23; 1 Chr. xviii. 17), then commander of 24,000 militia, who served in the third month of the year, a man therefore of the greatest influence, who afterwards, on the execution of Joab, held the supreme command of the whole army (ii. 35.) Concerning other men of this name, comp. *Ges. thes. s. v.*—Shimei, probably the Son of Elah, who, ch. iv. 18, is reckoned among Solomon's heroes. He is probably different from the Shimei of Ramah, who was set over David's vineyards, 1 Chr. xxvii. 27. Another still is the Benjamite Shimei, the Son of Gera (ii. 8.)—Rei (רֵעִי) is neither mentioned among David's heroes, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8 ff.; 1 Chr. xii. 10 ff., nor anywhere else.

V. 9. Like Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 12) Adonijah began his usurpation with a solemn sacrificial feast, to which, with the exception of Solomon and those who were known to be his faithful followers, he invited all his brothers—who, 2 Sam. iii. 4, 5, v. 14—16; 1 Chr. xiv. 4—7, are called the sons of David—and all the servants of the king. The well Rogel (spy-well), which lay, according to Jos. xv. 17, xviii. 16, on the border of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, is to be sought, according to 2 Sam. xvii. 17, on the east side of Jerusalem, not, however, with Michaelis, beyond the Mount of Olives, nor, as v. Raumer, Pal. p. 302 not. 76 still assumes, identical with the well of Mary, or the dragon well, but as Robins., Pal. ii. p. 138 ff., has shown, with the so-called well of Nehemiah, which the natives call *Bir Eyûb*, Job's well,[1] and which lies[2] below the junction of the valley of Hinnom with that of Jehoshaphat in a long plain covered with an olive grove and the traces of the former garden, the fairest and most fertile spot about Jerusalem, see Rob. i. p. q. —אֶבֶן הַזֹּחֶלֶת, λίθος τοῦ Ζωελέθ (LXX.), *lapis Zoheleth*, the Chald. renders אֶבֶן סְכוּתָא, *lapis speculæ*, the Syr. and

[1] The Arab. translation of the book of Joshua gives Rogel xv. 7 by عين ايوب, in chap. xviii. 16, on the contrary, عين روغال, lastly in this passage with the Chald. and Syr. fuller's-well عين القصار.

[2] Josephus is therefore quite correct in saying, that the feast took place without the city at the well in the king's garden (*Antiq.* vii. 14, 4.)

Arab. "great stone." The signification of the word is quite uncertain, see the various conjectures of the *Tanchum Hierosol.* thereupon in Rödiger, *de orig. et ind. arab. ll. V. T. hist. interpr. p.* 9, *not.* 7.

Vv. 11—14. Adonijah's revolt is thwarted by the watchfulness of the prophet Nathan. That the prophet was not guided by personal motives is plain of itself, see remarks on v. 5. Even Theodoret designates the assertion, that Nathan occasioned and effected the elevation of Solomon to the throne from mortified ambition, because Adonijah did not invite him to the banquet, ἀνοητῶς.—כִּי מָלָךְ, *quod regnum sibi arripuerit, Seb. Schmidt.*— V. 12. "And save thy life, &c." Had Adonijah actually succeeded in his usurpation, he would no doubt, after the death of David, have put to death Solomon and his mother as politically suspected persons, according to the barbarous custom of the east (comp. Tavernier Reis i. p. 253.)—On v. 13 comp. v. 5. The time when David gave Bathsheba the assurance on oath, that her son Solomon should be king, is unknown, but it was obviously after he had received the promise, 2 Sam. vii. Ephraim Syrus proposes various conjectures on this point.—V. 14. As David had, from too great weakness, easily yielded to Adonijah, and might confirm him in the kingdom, Nathan wishes, as prophet, to remind him of the Divine determination, and thereby confirm the words of Bathsheba. מִלֵּאתִי אֶת־דְּבָרָיִךְ, I shall make full thy words, that is, not, fully express, complete what is deficient (Vatbl., Grot., Gesen., Winer, *lex.*), but as the Chald. renders אֲקַיֵּם, confirm. *Videtur ad persuasionem referendum, q.d. si tu forte non poteris persuadere plane, ego mox venturus id implebo, te adjuvans.* Seb. Schmidt. This meaning alone can be maintained; for מִלֵּא דָבָר is elsewhere only used of the fulfilment of the Divine sentences or words, ch. ii. 27, viii. 15, 24, as πληροῦν, *implere,* in the classics, comp. Tholuck, Ausleg. d. Bergpr. p. 135 (1st ed.), and means, to make the word true by the issue, to establish by the reality. Analogous to this here, to establish by a similar statement.

Vv. 15—21. Bathsheba follows Nathan's counsel. V. 15. She went in unto the king, הַחַדְרָה, "into the inner chamber," because he could no longer leave his apartment from the weak-

ness of age. Concerning מְשָׁרַת = מְשָׁרַתַת see Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 133; Ew. Gr. § 389.—V. 16. The words וַיִּקֹּד וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ are often connected, Gen. xxiv. 26; Ex. xii. 27, xxxiv. 8; Num. xxii. 31, &c. The latter signifies the low obeisance, even to the earth, with which the Israelites approached eminent persons, especially kings. Among them this obeisance was a purely civil homage, whereas, among other eastern nations, for example the old Persians, who revered their king as the incarnation of Ormuzd, it consisted in formal adoration. On v. 17 comp. v. 13. In v. 18 the second וְעַתָּה, rather than וְאַתָּה, which is received by Schulz with the old versions, several *Codd.* and *Editt.* is to be retained as the more difficult reading, and with Maurer to be translated, "and now, my lord king, thou knowest it not.—V. 19. "But Solomon hath he not invited." Bathsheba adds this, not as if she felt herself aggrieved thereby, but because it showed clearly, that Adonijah already treated Solomon, who was known to him as the legitimate successor, as an enemy, and as soon as he seized the throne would no doubt remove him out of the way.—V. 20. "The eyes of all Israel are directed towards thee." *Decisio hujus causæ, in manu tua est, nam populus nondum adhæret Adoniæ, sed te spectat, quid hic facturus sis, et judicium tuum sequetur, modo tu festinaveris facere Salomonem regem.* Seb. Schmidt. In v. 21 Bathsheba enforces her argument by alluding to the fate awaiting her and her son beloved by David after the king's death. They will be חַטָּאִים, that is, guilty of a capital crime—*pœnas dabimus quasi læsæ majestatis rei essemus. Cler.*

V. 22—27. While Bathsheba still speaks, Nathan is announced to the king. As soon as he enters, Bathsheba retires (v. 28), not perhaps to avoid the appearance of mutual concert (Cler. Schultz, Deres.) but on the ground of propriety, because the wife should not be present at the audiences, which the king gave to his advisers. For similar reasons Nathan also withdraws (v. 31), when David calls Bathsheba back to him. Nathan's speech agrees as to the main fact (v. 24—27) with that of Bathsheba. V. 24. אַתָּה אָמַרְתָּ hast thou said? The question is merely indicated by the tone, comp. Ew. Gr. §. 577.—V. 25. "Let the king live," with this acclamation were the Israelitish monarchs

proclaimed by the people to be kings, v. 34, 39; 1 Sam. x. 24; 2 Sam. xvi. 16; 2 Chr. xxiii. 31.—V. 26. Those not invited to the feast were known to Adonijah as opponents of his revolt (v. 19.)—V. 27. Nathan closes his address with the doubt, whether Adonijah's undertaking could have proceeded from the king. אִם is an indirect question; whether this has really taken place (Maur.) The *plur.* עֲבָדֶיךָ is to be preferred to the Keri עַבְדְּךָ; Nathan means not only himself, but all the true servants of the king named in v. 26.

V. 28—31. In consequence of this disclosure David summons Bathsheba again before him, repeats to her the assurance on oath already given (v. 13), that Solomon should be king, and promises to proceed with his coronation on the same day; whereupon Bathsheba retires with deeper obeisance and a prayer for his perpetual happiness. The form of blessing, "let the king live for ever," was used by the Hebrews only on especially important occasions; the old Persians constantly so addressed their kings, Dan. iii. 9, v. 10, vi. 22; Neh. ii. 3. Comp. *Brissonius de reg. Pers. princ.* p. 16, and Hävern. Com. on Daniel ii. 4.

V. 32—35. Immediately on this David ordered the coronation of Solomon. V. 33. "The servants of your Lord," that is, the royal body-guard (v. 38.) The *plur.* אֲדֹנֵיכֶם refers not to David and Solomon, but to David, as Cler., referring to 2 Sam. xx. 6, has rightly remarked. The plural form, which occurs often in this word, especially when connected with suffixes (comp. *Ges. thes.* i. 328), is no *plur. excell.* in the sense of the Rabbins as *consuetudo honoris*, nor even a designation of abstract lordship, as Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 641 asserts, but is used "for the individual, when the idea comes to view in it as completely as in a plurality of appearances, so that this plurality is present in substance. For the ruled the idea of lordship concentrates itself in that of the ruler." Hengstenb. Beitr. z. Einl. ins. A. T. ii., p. 237. עַל־הַפִּרְדָּה אֲשֶׁר־לִי "upon mine own mule." As no one might mount the king's mule, so if the king allowed any one to ride thereon, it was thereby indicated that he was the successor to the throne. Among the old Persians not only the same custom prevailed, but riding on the king's horse was at the

same time a public mark of honour, which the king showed to highly meritorious persons before the people, comp. Esth. vi. 8, 9, and Cler. on the passage.—פִּרְדָּה the she-mule, which is even now in Cairo preferred to the he-mule for riding, "because she is more docile and can better endure fatigue." Comp. Sonnini in Rosenmüller's bibl. Althk. iv. 2, p. 56.—"And bring him down to Gihon." Gihon[1] (גִּיחוֹן) is, according to 2 Chr. xxxii. 33, xxxiii. 14, a well on the west side of Mount Zion, which formed two basins or pools, the upper water-course of Gihon (2 Chr. xxxii. 30), which is obviously identical with the upper pool (2 Ki. xviii. 17; Is. vii. 3, xxxvi. 2) and the lower pool (Is. xxii. 9.) The upper Gihon, in all probability the so-called dragon well, Neh. ii. 13 (comp. Robinson Pal. ii. p. 117, 166), still exists as a great reservoir lined with hewn stones, but somewhat dilapidated, called by the monks Gihon, by the natives *Birket-el-Mamilla*, about 700 yards W.N.W. of the Jaffa gate, in the beginning of the valley that skirts the west and south side of Zion, and in the south is called the valley of Hinnom. The lower pool, probably called also the lower Gihon, although this name does not occur in the Old Testament, lies in the south-west corner of Zion in the valley, and is called by the Arabs *Birket-es-Sultan*; comp. the description of this pool in Robins. Pal. ii. p. 129—33.—The valley lying between the two basins, which in tradition still bears the name of Gihon, and was measured in all directions and described by Robins. in. p. q. p. 39 f., is to be regarded as the place, where the anointing of Solomon was performed. For that this, as according to

[1] Great confusion has been introduced into the investigation concerning Gihon by the identity of Gihon and Siloa being assumed by most of the Rabbins and Christian theologians down to Rosenm., Gesen. and Winer, after the example of the Chaldee version, which explains גחון in vv. 33 and 38 by שִׁילוֹחָא, which was first partly explained by Tholuck in a valuable treatise on Siloa in his "Beiträgen zur Spracherkl. d. N.T." 1832 p. 123—33, and afterwards more fully by Robinson by a personal investigation on the spot. Tholuck rightly declared himself in favour of the diversity of Gihon and Siloa, and fixed the position of Gihon correctly in the West, but erroneously assumed that of Siloa in the southwest corner of Zion, and identified it with the lower pool, whereas the well Siloa is found on the south east slope of Zion at the mouth of the *Tyropæon*, comp. Robins. ii. 142 ff.

*Josephus Ant.* vii. 14, 5, Robinson p. 164 still thinks, took place at the well Gihon, is not in the text. The word הוֹרַדְתֶּם, bring him *down*, is also explained from this locality. "For if we go from Zion to Gihon westward, we first descend a slope and then ascend a gradual elevation; and this slope was probably in former times more considerable." Rob. i. p. q. p. 166 Not.—V. 34. "And blow ye with the horn." The horn שׁוֹפָר a great long, probably bent, according to the Rabbins also straight, horn, that gave a far-sounding note, and was specially employed for giving signals and on other solemn occasions, for example, the solemn proclamation of a king, for which purpose trumpets also were used, 2 Ki. xi. 14, see Hofmann, Hebr. Alterth. p. 597 ff., and Winer bibl. R.W. ii. p. 147.—V. 35. After the anointing is completed, David wishes to resign his throne to Solomon and to appoint him to be ruler (נָגִיד) over Israel and Judah. Both were necessary; the first, because the old king still lived; the second, because by the proceeding of Adonijah the succession was disputed. The end was also served by the anointing, which only took place when a new dynasty mounted the throne, or the succession was disputed, as in the case of Joash, 2 Ki. xi. 12, who was instituted king after the fall of Athaliah, who had usurped the sovereignty, and in that of Jehoahaz, whom the people elevated to the throne, 2 Ki. xxiii. 30 —as the Rabbins unanimously assert, comp. *Carpzov. appar. hist. crit. antiq. p.* 57 *sq.*—The distinction of Judah and Israel does not presuppose the separation of the kingdoms, but is quite suitable in the mouth of David, before whose mind, after the bitter experience he had had of the long-standing jealousy of Ephraim against Judah (see Gesen. Comm. on Is. xi. 13, and my apol. Vers. p. 61) it must have been again vividly presented, that the attempted revolt of Adonijah, like the conspiracy of Absalom (2 Sam. xix. 40 ff.) might add new fuel to the old jealousy. In such circumstances it was of considerable importance to declare Solomon King over Israel and Judah, as Ephraim with the tribes dependent on him had long assumed the name Israel in opposition to Judah, comp. 2 Sam. ii. 9, 10, 17, 28, iii. 17—21.

Vv. 36, 37. Benaiah answers the declaration of the royal will with the confirmatory, "Amen, so may Jehovah say;" that is,

may the word of the King be a word of the Lord, who fulfils what he says (Ps. xxxiii. 9), and adds the pious wish, that the Lord, as he had been with David, so would also be with Solomon, and make his throne greater than that of David. On this Theodoret strikingly remarks: *ᾔδεσεν ὡς οὐδεὶς ἔχων πατρικὴν φιλοστοργίαν ἐζηλοτύπησε παῖδας· καὶ ὡς ἴδιον πατέρων τὸ βούλεσθαι τοὺς παῖδας καὶ ἑαυτῶν λαμπροτέρους ὁρᾷν.*

Vv. 38—40. In accordance with the expression of the royal will the anointing of Solomon is immediately performed by the high priest Zadok in the presence of the prophet Nathan, the commander in chief Benaiah, the royal body guard, and a great multitnde of shouting and rejoicing people. V. 38. הַכְּרֵתִי וְהַפְּלֵתִי *σωματοφύλακες* (*Josephi Antiq.* vii. 5, 4), the corps of the royal body guard, 2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 18, xx. 7—23; 1 Chr. xviii. 17. Concerning these Cherethi and Pelethi from the oldest times various opinions prevail, see *Pfeifferi dub. vex p.* 392 *sq*, *Ikenii dissert. phil. theol.* No. 9, and Winer bibl. R. W. 1. p. 272 f. As to the grammatical form of the words, some still regard them (Winer, i. p. q. and Stier Lehrg. d. hebr. Spr. i. p. 215) though no longer with the same confidence as the older writers (s. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 525) as apocopated plurals, while Ewald now also acknowledges (Heb. Gr. p. 230, 3 ed.) the existence of the plur. in י, which he once altogether denied (S. Krit. Gr. p. 296 f.) and Gesen. has retracted much of the view propounded in the Lehrgeb. (S. Hebr. Gr. p. 150, 13 ed.), so that both at present, and certainly with justice, have agreed to regard the two words as adjective forms in י. Concerning their derivation and interpretation also scarcely a doubt can remain. For the opinion[1] put forward by the older writers (Pfeiffer. *l.c.*

[1] By Ewald (Krit. Gr. p. 297 and Gesch. d. V. Isr. i., p. 292, 295), Hofmann in his treatise, Under what dynasty the Israelites left Egypt? (in Ullmann and Umbreit's theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1839, P. 2, p. 415), Movers, d. Phöniz. i., p. 19, Bertheau in the Gesch. der Isr. 2 Abhdl. p. 197, Vatke, Br. Bauer, &c. This view rests chiefly on this, that the Philistines, 1 Sam. xxx. 14, Zeph. ii. 5, Ezek. xxv. 16, are called הַכְּרֵתִי and כְּרֵתִים; but in the two latter instances this name is designedly used by Ezek. with obvious allusion to הִכְרַתִּי, as the *Vulg.* intimates by its rendering: *interficiam interfectores.* Zephaniah also has selected the name with reference to its fundamental meaning *exci-*

Lakemacher *observ. phil.* ii. 11 *sq.)* and again strongly maintained in recent times, that כרתי as well as פרתי signifies the

*dere. Propriam hanc vim e memoria non excessisse, probat Zeph. hanc ipsam ob causam Philistæos Cretim vocans, ut sit nomen et omen* is the correct remark of Fr. A. Strauss, *vatic. Zeph. p.* 49. Thus only 1 Sam. xxx. 14 remains, where הכרתי certainly denotes either a Philistine tribe or the Philistines in general (comp. v. 16); but to conclude from this, that the Cherethi, the royal guard, were generally Philistines, is, to say the least, very rash. For even if David, according to 2 Sam. xv. 18, had Gathites in his army, it by no means follows that his body-guard was composed of Philistines, those hereditary foes of the Israelites. Against this derivation of הכרתי speak decidedly, *(a)* the term פלתי always connected with it, which according to Ewald must be contracted from פְלִשְׁתִי merely from similarity of sound, to which Gesenius has made the well-founded objection, *quis hujusmodi contractionem in linguis Semiticis ferat?* and *(b)* the exchange of the form כרי with כרתי. Mov., Berth., and Ew. certainly wish to stamp הַכָּרִי as a *nom. gent.* and understand it of the Κâρες, who, according to Herodotus i. 171–73, Thucyd. i. 8, Strabo xiv. 2, formed a part of the population of Crete, and as valiant soldiers served on pay even in Homer's time; but decidedly against this is the connexion of the כָּרִי with the רָצִים runners, 2 Ki. xi. 4, 19. The כרי, also, can be as little Carians, as the כרתי Cretans, and both together cannot for this reason be Philistines, because the hypothesis, that the Philistines were immigrants from Crete, notwithstanding what Bertheau in p. q. p. 186—200 has said for it, is still destitute of probability, as the only historical testimonies that can be adduced in its favour, the declaration of Tacitus, *hist.* v. 2; *Judæos, Creta insula profugos, novissima Lybiæ insedisse memorant, qua tempestate Saturnus, vi Jovis pulsus, cesserit regnis,* and the statement of *Steph. Byzant. s. v.* Γάζα, that this city was properly called Minoa from Minos King of Crete, according to the just opinion of Strauss, *l. c. p.* 47, *fabularum indolem tam aperte præ se ferunt, vix ut in censum veniant.* Meanwhile were this hypothesis much better grounded, yet neither כרי nor כרתי as a name of the Philistines could be derived from Crete and its population, because according to the Old Testament, (Deut. ii. 23; Am. ix. 7), the Philistines immigrated from Caphtor, and thus, according to their original land, might be called *Caphtorim*, but not *Crethim* and *Carim*, not to mention that according to Bertheau's own confession, (i. p. q. p. 195), "there are chronological difficulties in reckoning the Philistines among the Carian tribes, who were first compelled to leave the islands by Minos and the growing maritime power of the Greeks," because Minos, according to Höck, Kreta i. p. 300, is to be placed about 1300, while the Philistines already dwelt in Palestine in Abraham's time about 2000 B.C., and that the arguments for the identity of Caphtor and Crete are not such as to outweigh the authority of the LXX., the

Philistines, is not only inadmissible, because David would scarcely have trusted himself to a body guard composed of foreigners (Win. R. W. i. p. 273; *Ges. thes.* ii. 719), but is especially objectionable, because, 1, the conjunction of two synonymous names for one and the same people was rather extraordinary, for, as Gesen. *l.c. p.* 1107 very properly remarks, *quis credat duas appellationes synonymas hoc modo cumulatas esse? quasi dicas :* Englishman and Briton, Italian and Welsche; 2, because afterwards this designation of the royal body guard was exchanged with the like-signifying הַכָּרִי וְהָרָצִים (2 Ki. xi. 4—19), and in 2 Sam. xx. 23 הַכְּרִי stands beside הפלתי, where the Masorites would alter it without necessity into הכרתי. Both words are much rather proper appellatives; כרתי from כרת means *confossor, carnifex,* because among the Israelites, as generally in the East, the royal guardsmen executed the sentence of death on criminals;[1] פלתי from the Arab. فَلَتَ *fugit,* فَلْتٌ *celer,* cognate with פלט, means runner and = רָץ courier, because a part of the king's guardsmen like the ἄγγαροι of the Persians were obliged to bear the king's mandates to distant places, 2 Chr. xxx. 6, as is usual even to the present day in the Persian and Turkish courts, comp. Win. i. p. q.—V. 39. "The horn of oil out of the tabernacle" קֶרֶן הַשֶּׁמֶן an oil-flask of horn, 1 Sam. xvi. 1.—The oil, with which the kings, the anointed of the Lord, were anointed, was the priestly consecrated oil, the preparation of which was prescribed Ex. xxx. 22, although some Rabbins will not admit this, see Carpzov., *app. crit.* p. 56, γ.—הָאֹהֶל is scarcely the tabernacle of witness at Gibeon, but the holy tent which David erected for the ark of the covenant on Zion, 2 Sam. vi. 17, 1 Chr. xv. 1, xvi. 1.—V. 40. וַיַּעֲלוּ וגו׳, "and all the people came up after him," that is, accompanied him to the citadel of Zion, with flute

Chald. and Syr. versions, which explain *Caphtor* by Cappadocia, together with the other arguments in favour of this view, (comp. Bochart. *Phal.* iv. 32.

[1] The same thing is signified by כְּרִי from כּוּר *fodit perfodit,* comp. *Ges. thes.* ii. 671. For the interpretation attempted by Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 297, "the purchased slave," from כרה in the supposed meaning, to buy, is founded merely on two misunderstood passages of the Old Testament, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 28 f. The relation of כרי to כרתי explains the retention of the unusual form, כרי for כרים,

music[1] and loud acclamations of joy, so that the earth rang, (ותבקע וגו׳ is a hyperbolical expression.)

Ver. 41—48. The loud public joy reached the ears of Adonijah and his guests at the close of their entertainment. The music, together with the joyful cry of the people, must have sounded from Zion to the Well Rogel. When Joab perceives the note of the far-sounding horn he enquires—knowing the weighty occasion of this signal, and perhaps already suspecting the worst—in amazement, wherefore this noise of the city being in an uproar? At the same moment comes Jonathan, the son of Abiathar, with the intelligence, that Solomon was anointed King, and had ascended the throne. Quite characteristic is the confidence with which Adonijah expects good news, (v. 42); it is no doubt only assumed, pretended, as the will of his father concerning Solomon's succession, and the great and influential friends of the latter were not unknown to him, (v. 5, 19, 26.)—V. 43. אֲבָל *immo*, "*vellem quidem libenter bona tibi et grata nuntiare, sed nihil boni habeo.*" Seb. Schm.—The words of Jonathan, (v. 47), refer to the speech of Benaiah, vv. 36, 37. The prayer and thanksgiving to God for the grace that he had been allowed to look with his own eyes upon his successor on the throne (v. 47 f.), David uttered after the return of the anointed Solomon into the royal palace. The place for mentioning it was thus after v. 40; but the narrator here first inserts it, because he did not wish to interrupt the actual connexion between v. 40 and 41.—The aged David praying on his bed reminds us of the patriarch Jacob, who also, when Joseph promised him on oath the fulfilment of his last will, praying on his bed thanked his God for this grace, Gen. xlvii. 31.

beside רְצִים, on which Ew. i. p. q. incorrectly founds the assertion, that כרי must be a singular form.

[1] The flute, an instrument much loved by the ancients, was played both in joy and sorrow, Is. v. 12; Matt. ix. 23.

*Temporibus veterum tibicinis usus avorum*
*Magnus, et in magno semper honore fuit,*
*Cantabat fanis, cantabat tibia ludis,*
*Cantabat mœstis tibia funeribus.*

*Ovid. fast.* vi. 660 *seq.*

Many other proofs see in *Dougtaei anal.* ss. p. 12 sq., and on the nature of the flute, comp. Winer. bibl. R.W. ii. p. 146.

Vv. 49, 50. The intelligence of Solomon's accession to the throne spreads alarm among Adonijah's guests; they disperse—every man his own way. Adonijah himself sought refuge at the altar from the penalty of the rebel. Here it may be asked, which altar is meant, whether that in the tabernacle of testimony at Gibeon (Jarchi, Cler., Deres., &c.) or the altar of burnt-offering in the tabernacle on Zion, or that built by David on the threshing-floor of Ornan (2 Sam. xxiv. 25; 1 Chr. xxi. 26 ff.) (J. H. Michaelis)? The last opinion is the least probable; for even if David was wont to offer at this altar, where God heard his prayer in the pestilence and graciously accepted his offering, it may still be very much questioned, whether the right of asylum granted in the law (Ex. xxi. 14) to the altar of the sanctuary had also extended to this altar. Rather might we think of the altar at Gibeon, but even in this case we should expect an intimation that Adonijah had fled to Gibeon. The narrative is certainly very brief, but still vv. 50—53 make the impression, that Adonijah had not left Jerusalem. Besides, at the tabernacle of witness, priests of the family of Zadok hostile to Adonijah, officiated, in whose neighbourhood he could not consider himself as secure as in the sanctuary at Zion, where Abiathar, who was attached to him, presided as high-priest (ver. 8.) We must therefore decide for the second opinion. The altar of burnt-offering in the sanctuary on Zion certainly is nowhere expressly mentioned, but its existence is not only fully established by such passages as 2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Chr. xvi. 1; 1 Ki. iii. 15, but also its resemblance to the Mosaic altar is to be presumed as certain. The horns on the four corners of the altar, for the construction of which compare Bähr's Symb. i. p. 420 f., served as "symbols of blessing and salvation" (s. in p. q. p. 473) on which to sprinkle the blood of the offering in token that the sin was expiated and salvation given to the sinner. They were therefore a place of refuge for the unintentional homicide (Ex. xxi. 14.) "The perpetrator placed himself thereby under the protection of the saving, helping grace of God, which blots out sin and thereby abrogates the right of punishment; to remove and punish him who laid hold of these horns, would have been a violation of the divine might and help." (Bähr in p. q. p. 474.) It follows at once from the passage, that the right of refuge

granted in the law only to accidental homicide was in the course of time extended farther, so that other transgressors sought refuge at the altar. But the wilful murderer was not protected, and therefore not the traitor, comp. Ex. xxi. 14; Num. xxxv. 12; and *Mishna Macc.* ii. 6. Solomon, however, looks upon Adonijah's fleeing to the altar as a sign of repentance, and forgives his transgression with the threat of death as soon as he should be guilty of any new crime, vv. 51—53, which occurred only too soon, comp. ii. 13 ff.—V. 51. To the words of Adonijah: "let the king swear unto me to-day, that he will not slay his servant with the sword," we may not with Cler. supply: *hinc non discedam, nisi.* This would be an expression of defiance, which does not accord with the statement: "he feared before king Solomon." The words are much rather to be regarded as an entreaty; let Solomon promise on oath not to put me to death. Solomon does not give a promise on oath, but only his royal word, and more Adonijah could not expect. בֶּן־חַיִל *vir probus*, as אֵשֶׁת חַיִל Ruth iii. 11; Prov. xii. 4, xxxi. 10.—לֹא יִפֹּל וגו׳, "there shall not an hair of him fall to the earth," is a proverbial expression, like our own "nobody shall hurt a hair of his head," by which any one is secured from all violence and punishment, 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11. In the New Testament these words denote the most special Divine protection, care, and preservation from all harm, and misfortune, Luke xxi. 18; Acts xxvii. 34.—וְאִם רָעָה וגו׳, "but if wickedness be found in him, he shall die." Already by the attempted usurpation of the throne Adonijah had forfeited his life. Thus this threat is not too severe, after Solomon had forgiven him. The phrase וַיֹּרִדֻהוּ "and they brought him down" appears to indicate that Adonijah stood above the altar, that is, on the ledge surrounding the altar, especially if we compare the אֵצֶל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ of ii. 29.—וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ denotes submission to Solomon and recognition of him as king by doing homage, and not formal worship as Cler. thinks, comp. vv. 16, 23, 31.—With the words לֵךְ לְבֵיתֶךָ Solomon sets him at liberty.

# CHAPTER II.

LAST CHARGES OF DAVID AND HIS DEATH, v. 1—11. CONFIRMATION OF THE SOVEREIGNTY OF SOLOMON, vv. 12—46.

After Solomon was anointed king, the old king David summons the grandees of his kingdom, all the princes of the tribes, commanders of the army, stewards of the royal domains, court-officers, and mighty men to a royal diet at Jerusalem, presents to them Solomon the successor chosen of God, exhorts them to the observance of God's commandments, charges Solomon with the building of the temple, while he at the same time earnestly commends this matter to all assembled, hands over to him the model of the temple with all the material he had collected for it, prompts the grandees of the kingdom to a contribution to this important work, the execution of which God had not granted to him, but had committed to his son, and concludes this last assembly of the kingdom under his reign with a great sacrificial festival, in which the assembled estates of the kingdom did homage to Solomon and anointed him king the second time, and Zadok high priest, 1 Chr. xxiii. 1, and xxviii. 1—xxix. 24. Such a solemn homage of the representatives of the people and repeated anointing of the new king in the presence and at the desire of the estates of the kingdom took place also with Saul (1 Sam. xi.) and David (2 Sam. v. 1—3; 1 Chr. xi. 1—3); and appears to have been necessary to the general acknowledgment of the king on the part of the nation. Respecting this right of the people David, in order to obviate any rebellion against Solomon after his death, prepares in his life time, probably immediately after the anointing of Solomon mentioned in chap. i., which was accelerated by the attempt of Adonijah, this royal diet, in order that the representatives of the people might render the requisite homage to the divinely appointed successor. To this assembly of the kingdom mentioned only in Chronicles, the credibility of which, however, admits of no doubt, see Dahler, *de libr. Paralip. auct. p.* 74, is subjoined the last exhortation communicated in vv. 1—9 of this chapter, which the dying David addressed to his

son and successor Solomon, together with some special charges immediately before his death.

Vv. 1—4. "I go the way of all the earth," is a periphrasis of death, Jos. xxiii. 14. "In life," says Calmet, "each one has his particular route. One applies to one thing, another to another. But in the way to death they are all reunited. They go to the tomb by the one path."

*Omnium idem exitus est, sed et idem domicilium.*—PETRON. SATYR.

V. 3. The most important thing, with which the dying servant of God has to charge his son, is the obeying of the commands of God, by which alone he can secure to his reign stability and perpetuity, happiness, and blessing. משמרת יי׳ is neither *id quod Jehovah solet custodire* (Kimchi), nor obeying the law of a king, Deut. xvii. 16 (Calm.); but שמר משמ׳ יי׳ "to keep the charge of God," means in general to take care of God, his person, his will, his rights. משמרת is a pure abstract, with the signification, consideration, regard, observation, and the phrase שמ׳ מש׳ יי׳, which occurs very often in the Pentateuch, and is then adopted from it and still more frequently used by later writers, means to regard, observe[1] a person or thing, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 423 f.—The first and most general definition of משמ׳ יי׳ is "walking in the ways of God," that is, the conformity of the whole life to the Divine will, which excludes the *opus operatum* of the observance of the law. This is more strictly defined by the details in the following clause, as in Gen. xxvi. 5, Deut. xi. 1. The four words חקת, מצות, משפטים and עדות, of which the first three are found connected in Deut. v. 28, viii. 11; Ps. cxix. 5 ff., denote collectively the whole of the law according to its various aspects and relations to men. To regard the several words with Cler. as altogether synonymous is as incorrect as the distinction which is made by the *Crit. Sacr.* חקת statutes, are the prescriptions of the law, so far as its obedience is connected with definite rules and usages; מצות, commandments, as the expression of the

[1] Seb. Schmidt rightly: *Hebraismus est, qui hoc vult: custodies custodiam, quam debeo Jehovæ præstare, quæ custodia est hæc, ut serves mandata Jehovæ et in iis ambules.*

Divine will, which is to be fulfilled; מִשְׁפָּטִים, as the objective sentences and ordinances, the violation of which draws punishment after it; עֵדְוֹת, testimonies, as solemn declarations of the will of God against sin (comp. on עֵדוּת, Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 640 f.) All these statutes, commandments, judgments, and testimonies are found in the law of Moses, to obey which David binds his son.[1] לְמַעַן תַּשְׂכִּיל "that thou mayest deal wisely in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself."[2] The true wisdom of the servant of God, however, consists in obedience to the Divine commands, in walking in communion with God, Deut. iv. 6, xxix. 8. The whole exhortation contains evidently a reminiscence of Jos. i. 7, where the Lord himself, almost in the same words, confers on Joshua the office of captain of the host.—Princes, who deal wisely are prosperous, and spread safety and blessing among their people, Jer. iii. 15. Thus dealt David, and all Israel loved him (1 Sam. xviii. 14—16), and the Lord was with him, slew all his enemies and bestowed on him the promise of the perpetual dominion of his posterity, 2 Sam. vii. 8, 11—16. This promise will Jehovah confirm to Solomon, if he keep the way of the Lord and walk in it in truth with all his heart and all his soul. The לְמַעַן of v. 4 is subordinate to the לְמַעַן of ver. 3; the confirmation of the Divine promise depends on the wise dealing as its fruit and blessing. V. 4. David here states in a negative form the positive promise made to him, 2 Sam. vii. 11—16, "there shall not be cut off from thee a man on the throne of Israel," that is, thy posterity shall perpetually occupy the throne. This promise (ix. 5), confirmed by the Lord himself to Solomon on his prayer at the consecration of the temple (viii. 25), which was repeated at the time of the greatest humiliation of the royal house of David notwithstanding the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by

[1] That the mention of the Mosaic law has not been transferred by later authors to the time of David, as De Wette i. p. 159 ff. asserts, J. M. Hertz (Are any traces of the Pent. and the Mos. law to be found in the books of Kings? 1822. p. 6 ff.) and Hävern. Einl. i. 2, p. 579 f., have convincingly proved.

[2] Unproved is the meaning, *successum habuit*, assigned to הִשְׂכִּיל in this and other passages by Gesen. Comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 519.

the prophet Jeremiah (xxxiii. 17) for the strengthening and consolation of the faithful, found its full realization in Christ the great descendant of David, whose dominion will endure as long as the sun and moon stand (Ps. lxxii.) This complete fulfilment, which Jeremiah has alone in view, retires behind the proximate incomplete realization in the immediate bodily descendants of David, who occupied the throne till the overthrow of the kingdom. לֹא יִכָּרֵת וגו׳ is, moreover, not to be so understood as if no king of the house of David should be driven from the throne, but יכרת signifies only the complete extirpation of his race, so that no scion should remain to occupy the throne. אִישׁ מֵעַל כִּסֵּא is explained by אִישׁ יֹשֵׁב עַל כִּסֵּא in the parallel passages viii. 25 and Jer. xxxiii. 17. As soon as David's descendants failed to comply with the condition of the promise, they might be driven from the throne by way of chastisement without any infringement of the promise, because only altogether and for ever God would not withdraw his mercy from them, 2 Sam. vii. 15.

From v. 5 follow several special commissions. Vv. 5, 6. The commission to punish Joab for his crime. The clauses: "what Joab did to me, what he did to the two captains of the host," are connected, but not so closely as Mich. thinks, what Joab did to me in my two field officers. For although Joab had most deeply offended David by the twofold act of assassination perpetrated on Abner and Amasa, yet he had not grieved him by this alone, but also by his former conduct, when he put to death the rebellious Absalom in defiance of the express command of David before the whole host, and, moreover, scornfully upbraided the king, because he mourned for the death of his son, who, though disobedient, was ever dear to a father's heart (2 Sam. xviii. 5—15, xix. 1—6), and, finally, by the conspiracy with Adonijah, heinously transgressed against his lord and king, so that duty enjoined the king to warn his son and successor against a man who was dangerous on account of the great consideration he enjoyed with the army. Even this last circumstance, on which Theodoret lays stress,[1] would be sufficient to justify the commis-

[1] Μαθὼν συγκατασκευάζοντα αὐτὸν τῷ 'Ορνίᾳ (? 'Αδωνίᾳ) τὴν τυραννίδα, ἔδεισε μὴ τῇ συνήθει κακοηθείᾳ χρησάμενος, καταφρονήσῃ τῆς τοῦ Σολομῶντος

sion of David in a political point of view. But the commands of David did not rest, at least not alone, on political and personal considerations; for he mentions neither this last transgression nor the first wrong inflicted through the death of Absalom, but only thinks of the double assassination, by which Joab had twice forfeited his life. He had murdered Abner as well as Amasa from jealousy in a treacherous and malicious way. By the murder of Abner (2 Sam. iii.) he had, besides, placed David in so unfavourable a light with the eleven tribes who were on the point of acknowledging him as their king, that the suspicion, that he was the instigator of this foul deed, might easily have fallen upon him,—a suspicion which David only avoided by the most unfeigned sorrow and the public expression of his abhorrence of this crime, comp. Hess, Gesch. Dav. i., p. 292 ff. But should Joab excuse this deed on the ground that he took blood-revenge on Abner, because the latter had slain his brother Asahel in battle (2 Sam. ii. 23, iii. 27)—although this would have been a vain pretence, as blood-revenge did not extend to enemies slain in battle—yet this weak pretence failed entirely in the murder of Amasa, since Joab had slain him from pure thirst of power, 2 Sam. xx. 6—10, because David had promised him the post of commander-in-chief instead of Joab, 2 Sam. xix. 13. Even after the murder of Abner, David prayed for the Divine vengeance on Joab, but was himself unable to punish the crime, because the sons of Zeruiah (Joab and Abishai) were too mighty for him, 2 Sam. iii. 28 f., 39. But that he had only deferred the punishment and intended to remove Joab on the first opportunity from the office of commander-in-chief, is evident from the promise he gave to Amasa, the fulfilment of which Joab had frustrated by his murder. Now as the king felt himself unable to punish this crime, he commits its punishment to his successor. This commission, therefore, for which frivolous scoffers, such as Bayle, Tindal, not merely abused David, but attacked the Bible itself (see Lilienthal. d. gute Sache der Offenb. Part vi. § 303 f.), and others, as Vatke, die Rel. d. A. T. i. p. 308, have called in

νεότητος, καὶ δυοῖν θάτερον δράσῃ· ἢ εὐνοίας προσωπείῳ χρησάμενος ἀνέλῃ λαθὼν, ὥσπερ δὴ τὸν Ἀβεννὴρ καὶ τὸν Ἀβεσσâ κατέκτεινεν· ἢ προφανῶς ἀντιπαρατάξηται, καὶ διέλῃ τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

question the truth of the narrative, is completely justified at the bar of the strictest morals.[1]

V. 5. וַיָּשֶׂם דְּמֵי מִלְ׳ "and shed the blood of war in peace," that is, he shed in peace blood, which should only flow in war, namely, in the murder of Abner and Amasa—"and put the blood of war upon his girdle about his loins, and in his shoes on his feet." Concerning the sense of this phrase the opinions of expositors are very various. Lyra, C. a Lap., Vatabl., Cler., and others, understand the words quite literally, referring them to this, that Abner and Amasa were so pierced by Joab that they fell into his arms, and their blood flowed down on his girdle even to his shoes. J. D. Mich. conceives it figuratively, understanding it to be derived from this, that the girdle was perhaps dipt in the blood of the slain foes, thereby to promise them revenge. But even if such a custom could be proved, the words themselves have not the slightest reference to it.[2] The simplest way would be to supply בְּשָׁלוֹם from the preceding sentence, and, with Deres., to understand the phrase thus: in peace he stained himself or his raiment—his girdle and shoes—with the blood of war.—V. 6. "Do according to thy wisdom," *justam ejus puniendi occasionem observes*, Seb. Schmidt. The punishment of the mighty captain demanded wisdom, in order to occasion no mutiny in the army that was attached to him.—"Let not his gray hairs go down to the grave in peace," that is, let him, although he has gray hairs which ought to be honoured (Lev. xix. 32), not die a peaceful, natural death, that is, let him not go unpunished.

[1] J. D. Michaelis mentions that David, as near relative of Abner and Amasa, according to the right of the avenger of blood, might have avenged their death on Joab; but blood-revenge could not here be admitted, because Joab, as the son of Zeruiah, the daughter of Jesse (1 Chr. ii. 16), was David's nephew; not to mention that the king could not possibly take blood-revenge, an institute arising from the lawless state of nature, after it had been greatly restricted by Moses, and could only not be entirely abolished on account of the σκληροκαρδία of his people.

[2] Far-fetched also is that which Rosenm. (A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 162) adduces to prove that the words must mean, that the blood shed by Joab was intentionally shed more from cruelty than courage. The old versions also give no satisfactory explanation on the point.

V. 7. If the obligation of justice demanded the punishment of Joab, that of gratitude was no less sacred with the dying king. How the octogenarian Barzillai of Gilead provided King David and his followers with the means of life in their flight from Absalom to Mahanaim, and afterwards declined the king's invitation on his return to come with him to Jerusalem, and only permitted his son Chimham to go with him, is recorded in 2 Sam. xvii. 27 ff. and xix. 31 ff. On his death-bed the grateful king recommends his son to make all the children of this his perhaps already deceased benefactor companions at his board. וְהָיוּ בְּאֹכְלֵי וגו, "and let them be of those that eat at thy table." It is a question whether they were to eat at his table, that is, to enjoy the privilege of eating daily at the royal table, as Chardin and Harmer in Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 163 assume, or only to receive their food from the royal table, as, for example, Daniel and his companions, and among the Babylonians and Persians all the court-servants, (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 335, and Hävern. Comm. on Dan. i. 5), for which Calmet and others decide. We prefer the first opinion not only because אֹכְלֵי שֻׁלְחָן most naturally signifies those who eat at the table of any one, but also because the receiving of board and maintenance from the royal table was no special distinction, but only an equivalent for the want of pay to which every person in the King's service was entitled; comp. also 2 Ki. xxv. 29.—"For so they came to me," that is, they did me the kindness of entertaining me. Only Barzillai indeed is mentioned, 2 Sam. xvii. 27, but probably his children also took an active part in the matter.

Vv. 8, 9. The kind deed of Barzillai reminds David of the contrary conduct of the Benjamite Shimei, who not only assailed him with bitter injurious words in his flight from Absalom, but even attacked him with stones, 2 Sam. xvi. 5—8. קְלָלָה נִמְרֶצֶת, a grievous violent curse, Mic. ii. 10. מָרַץ is cognate with פָּרַץ, to break, פָּרִיץ, violent. Shimei abused David as a bloodhound and a miscreant, 2 Sam. xvi. 7. At that time David bore these slanders patiently, and not only forbade Abishai to slay him, but forgave Shimei when he met him with penitent entreaty after Absalom's fall on his return over the Jordan, and guaranteed his

life with an oath, 2 Sam. xvi. 9—13, 18—24. It is therefore the more surprising, that the King, after forgiving the slanderer at the time when the slander wounded him so deeply, should on his death-bed years after think of this deed, and charge his son with its punishment. J. D. Michael., Deres., and others, plead in excuse that David ordered the punishment out of paternal concern for the security of his son's reign. Seb. Schm. and others endeavour to defend it on the presumption that Shimei had altered his demeanour and showed himself unworthy of the favour conferred on him. The words אַל־תְּנַקֵּהוּ "hold him not guiltless," certainly appear to be opposed to the assumption that David had discovered "rebellious dispositions" in him, and to intimate that David, although he had forgiven him the personal wrong, and had guaranteed his life on oath merely because he did not wish to disturb the joy on his recovery of the throne by a penal sentence, 2 Sam. xix. 23, yet as king and representative of the Divine right in the theocracy had not forgiven the crime of high treason, of which Shimei had become guilty, by reviling the Lord's anointed, and according to theocratic right could not forgive it, because the Lord himself was insulted in his anointed. But the following words, "for thou art a wise man," as well as Solomon's treatment of Shimei, (v. 36 ff.), indicate very emphatically that David and Solomon had no confidence in the disposition of Shimei. Accordingly in this charge David is to be acquitted not only of personal vindictiveness but of every injustice.[1] The punishment of Shimei was the duty of the theocratic ruler, for "Shimei was a blasphemer against the chosen of God, and his repentance was not genuine." Fr. v. Meyer.—V. 8. עִמְּךָ, in thy neighbourhood. Shimei at this time probably resided in Jerusalem, comp. v. 36.—בְּדָם is the opposite of בְּשָׁלוֹם, v. 6.

[1] "Shimei is and remains a proof rather of David's magnanimity than of his vindictiveness. To endure the miscreant all his life in his neighbourhood (there was nothing even said of banishment) was no small thing. To suffer him to close his days unmolested under another reign also (which was never promised him) would have been a boon which would have given a very injurious example of unpunished transgression." Such is the judgment of J. J. Hess, Gesch. Dav. ii. p. 210.

V. 10. The death and burial of David. The city of David is the stronghold of Zion, where David's sepulchre was extant even in the days of Christ, Acts ii. 29.[1]—On v. 11, comp. 2 Sam. v. 5. At Hebron David reigned properly seven and a half years, and at Jerusalem thirty-three.—Here and in 1 Chr. xxix. 27, the full number merely is given.

V. 12 forms the introduction to the history of Solomon's reign. In the following verses is recorded the manner in which Solomon established his authority by the punishment of the parties suspected of sedition.

Vv. 13—18. Adonijah comes to Bathsheba, and prefers the request that she would apply for him to her son King Solomon, that he might give him Abishag the Shunammite to wife. V. 13. הֲשָׁלוֹם בֹּאֶךָ, is thy coming peace? that is, comest thou with peaceable good intent? (1 Sam. xvi. 4.) After the recent events (i. 5 ff.) Bathsheba might easily imagine evil designs. The speech of Adonijah (v. 15) is not so "extremely offensive" (as Mich. thinks), that Bathsheba ought not to have listened to it. In the words: "thou knowest that the kingdom was mine," he merely appeals to his greater age, by reason of which he thought he might lay claim to the throne (comp. v. 22, and the remarks on i. 4.) Many eyes also among the people might have been directed to him, though the assertion, that all Israel set their faces on him, was beyond the bounds of truth, as all true theocrats knew that the Lord had chosen Solomon as successor. The captious part of his speech, however, was concealed by the addition, that Jehovah had transferred the kingdom to his brother, so that Bathsheba, thinking his words to be sincere, did not mark the evil intent. וַתִּסֹּב וגו׳, "the kingdom is turned," that is, from me and to my brother. V. 16. "Turn not away my face," that is, deny me not my request. The re-

[1] According to a Rabbinic statement in Lightfoot, *hor. Hebr. et Talm. ad Act.* ii. 29, David must have died at Pentecost. No more attention is due to this statement than to the account of Josephus (*Antiq.* vii. 15, 3, xiii. 8, 4, xvi. 7, 1, *de bell. Jud.* i. 2, 5) of the great treasures which Solomon deposited in his tomb, and Hyrcanus and Herod plundered, of which a refutation, no longer necessary in our times, is to be found in Calmet and Clericus *ad h. l.*, and in *Buddei hist. eccl. V. T.* ii. p. 172. *ed.* 3.

quest is very artful (comp. on v. 22), and Bathsheba does not mark the cunning of Adonijah, but with womanish simplicity takes his demand for an innocent desire, and promises to make application for him to the king.

Vv. 19—22. She betakes herself therefore to Solomon, and is received by him with all the respect due to a mother. וַיָּקָם לִקְרָאתָהּ, "and he rose up to meet her"—a pregnant sense for, rose up and went to meet her—and caused her to take her place on a seat at his right hand. The seat at the right hand was the place of honour among the Israelites, comp. Ps. cx. 1, and Joseph. *Antiq.* vi. 11, 9, as among the Greeks and Romans, for which Aristotle assigns the reason, διὰ τὸ ἰσχυρότερον εἶναι τὴν φύσιν τῶν δεξιῶν, see *Dougt. annal. ss.* i. 169 *sq.*[1]—V. 20 f. Regarding her request as so small, that the king will not refuse her, Bathsheba prefers it quite freely. (On the constr. of the pass. יֻתַּן with אֶת, comp. Ew. Gr. § 494.) But Solomon, penetrating Adonijah's designs at a glance, indignantly exclaims: "Why dost thou ask Abishag the Shunammite for him, ask for him the kingdom also; for he is mine elder brother; even for him, and for Abiathar the priest, and for Joab." V. 22. וְלוֹ depends still on שַׁאֲלִי. By the advice of these two wily friends, probably, Adonijah had asked the concubine of David for himself to wife, in order to make good thereby his claim to the throne. If Solomon had given him Abishag, he would thereby have acknowledged his claims in the eyes of the people. For the Israelites regarded the wives and concubines of the deceased king as the property of his successor, comp. 2 Sam. xii. 8, iii. 7, 8; Mich. Mos. R. ii. § 54, 7, and the decisions of the Rabbins in *Seldeni uxor Hebr. l.* i. c. 10. To put himself in possession of the royal harem was held among them, as among the ancient Persians (Herod. iii. 68), to be a public confirmation of his claim to the throne. This explains Solomon's indignant answer. But was Bathsheba ignorant of this general opinion? After what

[1] The representative of the king (الرِدافة) sat at the right of the old Arabic kings, see Eichhorn, *monum. antiq. hist. Arab.* p. 220, whereas among the old Persians the left side was the more honourable according to Xenophon, Cyrop. viii. 4, 3.

Absalom had done by the counsel of Ahithophel, 2 Sam. xvi. 21, it could not be unknown to her. But perhaps she did not think of this, because Adonijah's wily speech had taken her by surprise, and David also had not known Abishag (i. 4), so that she was not in the proper sense of the term one of his concubines. If the case had been otherwise the request would have been in itself contrary to the law of Moses, Lev. xviii. 8.

Vv. 23—25. Hereupon Solomon vowed that Adonijah should die, and ordered Benaiah to put him to death. The form: "God do so to me and more also," that is, so do God to me continually, is a usual form of swearing, Ruth i. 17; 1 Sam. xiv. 44, xx. 13; Jer. xxii. 5, which in 1 Sam. iii. 17, xxv. 22; 2 Sam. xix. 14; 2 Ki. vi. 31 is followed by אִם, which often stands elliptically in swearing, God punish me, if I do this = truly I will not do this, see Gesen., Lehrgeb. p. 844. Now since כִּי follows here as in Ruth i. 17; 1 Sam. xiv. 44, we might be disposed to render כִּי by if, especially as it actually precedes the form of adjuration in this sense in 1 Sam. xx. 13; but this sense does not suit either in this passage or the others; the negation must remain as it is; it must thus be taken here for ὅτι as introducing the oath, which is clearly proved by 2 Sam. iii. 35, where כִּי is prefixed to the אִם. Thus כִּי stands after the form of adjuration חַי יי׳ v. 24; 1 Sam. xx. 3, xxv. 34, &c.—בְּנַפְשׁוֹ "against his life," to the danger of his life, to his destruction has Adonijah spoken this (בְּ *est pretii ut in eodem contextu*, 2 Sam. xxiii. 17; Prov. vii. 23; Thren. v. 9. Maurer.)—V. 24,[1] "who hath made me an house," that is, hath given me a family, a posterity, as he promised, 2 Sam. vii. 11. עָשָׂה בַּיִת = the more usual בנה בית *sobolem, prolem dedit, cf. Ges. thes.* i. p. 193. According to xi. 42, compared with xiv. 21, and 2 Chr. xii. 13, Solomon had already a son, Rehoboam, a year old.—V. 25. As

[1] The penultimate Jod in ויושׁיבני may either be introduced by mistake, as Hitzig, Begr. d. Krit. p. 138, supposes, or as Maurer thinks, intentionally inserted to indicate the pronunciation *eni*, although the Masoretes pronounce *ani*, and the difference of vowel between the suffix of the pret. and that of the fut. is not uniformly observed, comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 206, Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 383, hebr. Gr. p. 184.

soon as the sentence is pronounced,[1] it is forthwith executed by Benaiah, the captain of the guard. Among the Israelites (vv. 34, 46; 2 Ki. xi. 15, 16) as among the old Egyptians (Gen. xl. 17, and Hengstenb. die BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 23) and Babylonians (Dan. ii. 14, and Lengerke on the passage), the punishment of death was immediately inflicted without any formality by the captain of the guard, as it is at present in the East among the Turks and Persians, see the numerous proofs in Paulsen, Regier. d. Morgenl. i. p. 355, Mich. Mos. R. v. § 232, and Rosenm. A. u. R. Morgenl. i. p. 181.

V. 26. How free Solomon was from personal revenge and excessive severity in the punishment of the rebel is shown in his conduct towards Abiathar, the high priest, which puts those to shame who, as Gramberg, Krit. Gesch. d. Religionsid. d. A. T. i. p. 390, call him fainthearted and cruel. As accomplice in the conspiracy of Adonijah, he had in strict justice deserved death; but Solomon spares his life partly on account of his priestly dignity—because he had borne the ark of the Lord before David, as well in the solemn removal of it to Jerusalem, 1 Chr. xv. 11, 12, as in David's flight from Absalom, 2 Sam. xv. 24—29—partly on account of the sufferings, hardships, and dangers, in which he had participated with David in his protracted flight from Saul; removes him merely from the priesthood which he had forfeited by resisting the anointed of the Lord, and banishes him to his country-seat at Anathoth. אִישׁ מָוֶת אָתָּה "thou art worthy of death," thou hast certainly deserved death, but I will not at this time put thee to

[1] This sentence also has found censors. Even Cleric. and Hess in p. q. p. 239 f. find it certainly agreeable to the spirit of Eastern statesmanship on the presumption that Adonijah had had in his petition treasonable designs on the throne; but they are not willing to approve or commend it. But it cannot be a question of praise or blame where the Divine law demands its right. All attack or censure depends on unbiblical views of law and right, and on a complete misunderstanding of the theocratic point of view, according to which alone the question can be decided. By the attempt to usurp the throne Adonijah had already rebelled against Jehovah, who had appointed Solomon as the successor of David. Now if, after Solomon had forgiven his transgression, he comes out with a new attempt at rebellion, duty to God and the theocracy demanded of Solomon not to have respect to consanguinity, but to act according to the rigour of the law.

death. בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה limits the absolution from the sentence of death, as Solomon did not foreknow whether Abiathar would demean himself peaceably for the future.

In v. 27 the theocratic author of these books remarks that by the removal of Abiathar from the priesthood the announcement of the Lord concerning the house of Eli, 1 Sam. ii. 30—33, was fulfilled. With this is connected also the double high-priesthood, which existed from Eli's times for the two separated sanctuaries, since the ark of the covenant after its capture by the Philistines (1 Sam. iv.) was never brought back to the tabernacle of witness, see Movers, Krit. Untersuch. p. 291 ff.—How Eli the descendant of Ithamar, 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, attained to the high-priesthood, though this office was promised in perpetuity to the family of Eleazar (Num. xxv. 13) the history does not state, comp. *Cler. ad* 1 *Sam.* ii. 30. It is possible that in the earlier occasional removals of the ark of the covenant from the tabernacle of witness, if it was taken in war, in such seasons of the division of the sanctuary a special high-priest of the line of Ithamar was chosen for the service in the tabernacle of witness, and that after the death of the high-priest of Eleazar's family, Eli alone retained this office. To him succeeded, as his two sons fell in the battle with the Philistines (1 Sam. iv. 14), before his own death, his grandson Ahitub, the son of Phinehas; to him his son Ahiah, 1 Sam. xiv. 3; to him his brother Ahimelech, who was murdered with the rest of the priests at Nob by Saul, 1 Sam. xxii., and to him finally the Abiathar who was saved from the massacre (1 Sam. xxii. 20, comp. *Relandi Antiq. ss. P.* ii. *c.* 2 § 2), by whose removal now recorded the line of Eleazar in Zadok again attained to the exclusive possession of the high priesthood.[1]

[1] The pedigree of Zadok in Selden, *de success. in pontif. l. i. c.* 4, does not quite agree either with 1 Chr. vi. 4 ff., nor with the statements of Josephus, Antiq. viii. 1, 3. Whether his nearest progenitors, Meraioth and Ahitub (1 Chr. ix. 11; Neh. xi. 11), perhaps during the wars with the Philistines under Samuel and Saul, when the ark must have been a long time at Gilgal, as Mov. in. p. q. p. 291 f. has shown, although Hitzig (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1835. Febr. p. 134) without reason assigned denies this—had already officiated there as priests, cannot be determined from want of records. We only learn from 1 Sam. vii. 1 that the ark, when sent back by the Philistines, was de-

Vv. 28—34. As soon as the report of the execution of Adonijah and the deposition of Abiathar reaches Joab, he seeks refuge at the altar, (not of the tabernacle of witness, but of the ark of the covenant, comp. on i. 50), because he was involved in the insurrection of Adonijah.[1] As it could not be unknown to him, that the altar did not protect the rebel and the murderer, it may be inquired why he sought safety there and did not even leave the altar at the summons of Benaiah. C. a Lap. gives the true answer: *sperabat quod loci sanctitas eum tutaretur, nec Salomonis religio permitteret eum ibidem occidi.* On the same ground Benaiah refers the decision to the king, v. 30 f.—Although Joab answers Benaiah, "here will I die," yet he hopes in his heart for mercy; but Solomon lets the law take its course, and orders to slay him at the altar in order to free himself and his family from the guilt which lay on them, as long as Joab had not received punishment for the twofold act of assassination, comp. Numb. xxxv. 30 f.; Deut. xix. 13.—The words of Solomon, v. 33, refer to the curse, which David pronounced on Joab and his posterity after the murder of Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 28 f.—V. 34. In consequence of the king's command to bury the slain (v. 31), which is founded upon the law, Deut. xxi. 22 f., Joab was buried with his family (בְּבֵיתוֹ) in the wilderness of Judah.—On v. 35 comp. i. 8 and ii. 27.

V. 36—40. After the punishment of the rebel Solomon also summons Shimei before him, who was probably still residing at Bahurim, and whose disposition was likewise suspicious, and commands him to build himself a house in Jerusalem, and not to leave it on pain of death, as soon as he leaves the city to go any whither, and crosses the brook Kidron which flowed on the east side of Jerusalem between the city and the Mount of Olives,

posited in the house of Abinadab, on the hill at Kirjathjearim, and his son consecrated to minister to it: and under David both high priests, Zadok and Abiathar, are already met with in the first year of his sovereignty over all the tribes, 1 Chr. xv. 11.

[1] Perhaps Joab had given Adonijah the counsel to ask Abishag for himself to wife, as Ahithophel before gave similar advice to Absalom, 2 Sam. xvi. 21. At least Solomon appears to have presumed this, although we cannot with certainty infer it from the flight of Joab, and Solomon also punishes Joab solely on account of his transgression in the case of Abner and Amasa, v. 32.

in order to escape, it might be, to his birthplace Bahurim, situated in the wilderness of Jericho[1] (2 Sam. xv. 23, xvi. 5.)—Concerning the form אָנָה וָאָנָה whither and whither = any whither *quocunque*, with negative preceding, no whither (v. 36), comp. Hupfeld in d. Zeitschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl. ii. 3, p. 461.—V. 37. The phrase: "thy blood shall be on thine own head" (בְּרֹאשֶׁךָ, or, come upon thy head (עַל) is a *term. techn.*, borrowed from the law to denote the punishment of death. On the ground of the command given to Noah: "whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed," Gen. ix. 6, it was employed by the lawgiver according to the fundamental principle, life for life (Ex. xxi. 23), at first indeed only in the punishment of murder and premeditated death, but afterwards it was transferred also to other crimes worthy of death, for example, Lev. xvii. 4, to sacrificing not at the tabernacle of witness, "blood (blood-guilt) shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood." In this sense Moses often uses the brief form, his blood be on him or upon him (בּוֹ or עָלָיו), Lev. xx. 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, &c., for various offences.—V. 38. Shimei himself acknowledges the equity of this sentence, promises obedience to the king with an oath (v. 42), and for a considerable time (יָמִים רַבִּים) remains true to his oath. But when two of his slaves, three years after, ran away from him and escaped to Achish, king of the Philistines, to Gath, he set out and brought them back thence, v. 39, 40.—Achish, the son of Maachah, is obviously the same with Achish, son of Maoch, with whom David twice found protection from Saul (1 Sam. xxi. 10 ff., xxvii. 2); for a reign of fifty years does not belong to the domain of the inconceivable.

Vv. 41—46. As soon as the transgression of his command reached the ears of Solomon, he calls for Shimei, upbraids him with the breach of his sworn promise, pronounces upon him the

[1] Bahurim lay not on the site of *Abu Dis*, as v. Schubert, Reise in d. Morgenl. iii. p. 70 f. thinks, but farther north, as Robins. Pal. ii. p. 312 has rightly remarked, and indeed in or at the valley stretching from the middle of the Mount of Olives in an easterly direction, comp. Thenius in the "biblischen Studien von Geistlichen d. Königr. Sachsen," published by Käuffer, annual series 2 (1843), p. 154 f., and the map accompanying the volume.

sentence of death, and causes it to be executed by Benaiah. This proceeding appears very harsh to the subjective modern view of history. Shimei has surely, it is thought, committed no great offence, if he has brought back his slaves, which he probably bought and paid for with hard cash, and thus helped himself to his own lawful property (Engl. Cyclop. of the Bible); perhaps he thought, also, that his journey to Gath was no transgression of the royal command, because he did not require to cross the Kidron (Cleric.) On such grounds expositors have endeavoured to excuse Shimei, and at the same time to prove Solomon's rigour. But Shimei cannot be exculpated. The subtle evasion devised by Cler. is refuted by the plain words of the text, which forbid him to go any whither out of Jerusalem (vv. 36, 42); and the reference to the cash which his slaves may have cost him is no less empty an argument. If Shimei wished to remain true to his oath, he should have informed the king of the flight of his slaves, petitioned him for leave to bring them back, and awaited his directions, but he ought not to have lightly broken his oath. In his perjury lay his guilt, and he had no excuse, as Solomon showed him (vv. 42, 43), to which was added his high treason committed against David, v. 44, comp. the remarks on v. 8. In the punishment of this crime, Solomon thus only vindicated the Divine right, and might therefore regard it as a retribution suspended by Jehovah over Shimei for his transgression, for which God will bless him by the fulfilment of the promise made to David of the perpetual duration of his throne, v. 45.

The last words of v. 46: "And the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon," serve to close the subjects thus far handled. Comp. on this peculiar closing formula of the Shemitic historiography Ewald, Compos. d. Genes. p. 138, 164 ff.—בְּיַד means not *studio* (Dathe), but either simply by, or in the hand, that is, in possession of.

# CHAPTER III.

SOLOMON'S MARRIAGE AND WORSHIP OF GOD, VV. 1—3; HIS SOLEMN PRAYER AND OFFERING AT GIBEON, VV. 4—15; AND HIS WISE DECISION OF A CASE IN LAW, VV. 16—28.

After the establishment of the sovereignty of Solomon has been related, ch. ii., the description of his reign begins with the statement of his domestic and religious life. Both were defective in the beginning of his reign. The daughter of Pharaoh, whom he married, he was not able to receive into his palace, v. 1, and he was not able to worship the Lord in the place chosen by himself for his name, vv. 2, 3. Both these defects were first remedied by the buildings he erected, comp. ix. 24 f.

V. 1. Solomon made alliance with Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by taking his daughter to wife. If Solomon formed this connexion after ascending the throne, for which the placing of the fact here seems to speak, he had already married at least an Ammonitess, Naamah, and by her had one son Rehoboam, comp. on ch. ii. 24. With regard to the daughter of Pharaoh, the old expositors have many discussions on the question whether this marriage was a transgression of the Divine law or not. The Rabbins, Lyra, Münster, C. a Lap., give a negative answer, as the Rabbins expressly teach that the daughter of Pharaoh was a proselyte; whereas Calm., Seb. Schm., &c., think that Solomon sinned because Pharaoh's daughter was not a proselyte; and Theod. and Procop. even assert, that he thereby transgressed the law, which forbade intermarriage with strangers. In order to decide this point we must separate two questions, (*a*), the question whether marriage with the daughter of an Egyptian king was forbidden? Here the answer must be in the negative, because the law only expressly forbids marriage with the Canaanites, Ex. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3, and even permits to marry strange wives and maidens taken captive in war after allowing them a time for mourning, Deut. xx. 10—14. But even if the law did not forbid every marriage with foreigners, yet it must not be at once concluded that it approved of such marriages. They only accorded with the spirit of the law, when

the foreign woman professed faith in Jehovah; (*b*), the question whether the daughter of Pharaoh was a proselyte, or to express it more correctly, whether she renounced idolatry and professed her faith in the God of Israel? This, if discussed at all, must be inferred partly from the circumstance that she is neither, ch. xi., named among the wives of Solomon who practised idolatry and betrayed the old king into it, nor is a single trace of Egyptian idolatry to be found in Judah during the whole of this reign, and partly from the character of Solomon. As he in the beginning of his reign loved Jehovah and walked in his ways, (v. 3), he surely would not have indulged his Egyptian consort in the practice of idolatry. A different conclusion certainly might be assumed from the fact that he did not allow her to dwell in the stronghold of Zion, where the ark of the covenant was, but brought her into the city of David, that is, Jerusalem, until on finishing his buildings he could assign her a residence built for her in his new palace, (vii. 8, ix. 24; 2 Chr. viii. 11); but this proceeding rather indicates the contrary. If Solomon, in conformity with the law, paid so much regard to the sanctity of the ark, that he did not allow Pharaoh's daughter as a foreigner to dwell in the same building with it, he will have paid still more regard to the prohibition of idolatry. His keeping her at a distance from Zion, the fort consecrated by the presence of the ark has its ground not in the idolatry of his Egyptian consort but in his reverencing the law, which Deut. xxiii. 7, 8, commands not to abhor an Egyptian, but to admit only his descendants into the congregation of the Lord.—בֵּיתוֹ is correct, and the conjecture proposed by Cler. בֵּיתָהּ is not needed.

Vv. 2, 3. General judgment concerning the state of religion in the beginning of Solomon's reign. People and king worshipped Jehovah, only they offered sacrifice to him on the high places because the temple, the sole place of sacrifice, was not yet built.—רַק means neither *ceterum* nor *attamen*, but here also simply "only," and is invariably *particula extenuandi et excipiendi*, comp. *Wineri lex. s.v.* The use of this particle in phrases relating to worship in high places is so constant in these books that it is inserted even here where it does not appear suitable. Usually the formula, "only the high places were not removed

and the people offered and burned incense still in the high places," is appended to the remark, that this or that king walked in the way of the Lord, comp. xxii. 44; 2 Ki. xii. 4, xiv. 4, xv. 4, 35. This statement is here also to be completed in thought. The author wishes to relate how Solomon worshipped the Lord before the building of the temple, and should thus have placed the statement concerning the worship of the people after v. 3. But in order not to interrupt the connexion between v. 3 and 4 ff., he premises this formula, to which the רַק appears unsuitable. The בָּמוֹת were altars erected on rising grounds and hills—probably because men believed the Deity to be nearer there, whence heights and hills were favourite places of sacrifice among all nations, comp. Gesenius, Preface to Gramb.'s Religionsid. i. p. xiv. ff., and *thesaur.* i., 188, and Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. ii. p. 221 f. —and, consecrated to the worship of Jehovah, are thus to be distinguished from the altars of idols. Yet they were forbidden in the law, because, as Häv. Einl. i. 2 p. 592 justly remarks, "they threatened great danger to strict monotheism (as they were prejudicial to the idea of the living God, who manifests himself in concrete unity), and especially on account of the similar custom of neighbouring heathen nations, easily descended into idolatry." To prevent this as much as possible God had appointed the national sanctuary to be the exclusive place of his worship, Lev. xvii. 3 ff.; but so long as this sanctuary was only a wandering tabernacle, and Jehovah had not yet chosen any fixed place for his worship (Deut. xii. 13 f.), this law could not be carried into complete effect. The offering, therefore, on the high places is here excused on this ground, that the temple was not yet built; for after the building of the temple the worship in high places was an altogether forbidden service, the extinction of which, however, the most pious kings could not entirely accomplish. In order to set forth still more distinctly, that the offering on the high places was at that time permitted, the author adds: "Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father."

V. 4. To the general statement concerning the state of religion at that time is annexed the narrative of the solemn offering which Solomon made at Gibeon after his establishment in the

sovereignty.[1] This offering was of national import. It was an expression on the one side of thanks for the establishment of the new reign, on the other of prayer for its farther prosperity. Hence also the representatives of the people took part in it (2 Chr. i. 2), and burnt-offerings were presented in such numbers.

Vv. 5—9. What was wanting to the place of offering at Gibeon, the presence of Jehovah connected with the ark, that the Lord supplied in this offering by the immediate appearance which he made to Solomon in a dream on the night after his sacrifice (v. 15; 2 Chr. i. 7.) The prayer of Solomon uttered in a dream is not according to the well-known proverb, dreams are vain, a mere fancy picture, but a real expression of the wish that animated the soul of the young king in his offering. The prayer of Solomon begins with the praise of the great favour, that the Lord, in conformity with the promise he made to David, 2 Sam. vii., had now exalted him on the throne of David, then proceeds to the confession of his weakness and inability to discharge aright the high office entrusted to him, to rule well the numerous people of God, and to distinguish righteously in judgment the good from the bad, and closes with a petition for the requisite wisdom and discernment. *Διὰ δὲ τούτων καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἔδειξε τὴν ἀσθένειαν καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας τὸ ἀτελὲς καὶ τῆς δοθείσης ἐξουσίας τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ τῆς κρίσεως ἐπικίνδυνον καὶ τῆς φρονήσεως τὸ ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὸ συνετὸν τῆς αἰτήσεως.* Theod.—נַעַר קָטֹן, that is, a weak boy. How old Solomon was at that time we do not know, scarcely more than twenty years. The idea of the נער is quite relative. Here it denotes the youth still deficient in the experience of life, as appears from the addition: לֹא אֵדַע צֵאת

[1] By connecting the sacrifice at Gibeon with the remark concerning the offerings on the high places, the place of offering at Gibeon is put in the category of בָּמוֹת, which were excused during the provisional state of the national sanctuary. Yet by the addition: "for that was the great high place," it is still distinguished from the common high places. For here was the old tabernacle of witness with the Mosaic altar of burnt-offering, 2 Chr. i. 3, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 390 ff. But the tabernacle of testimony itself, since the ark was separated from it, had dwindled into a mere shadow of the true sanctuary, and become quite similar to the other במות.

נַעַר, a proverbial expression for inexperience in the practical wisdom requisite for a pious upright walk. Rightly paraphrased by Vatabl. *nescio quomodo me gerere debeam in administratione tanti regni.* The description of the greatness of the chosen people (v. 8) rests upon the promise made to Abraham, Gen. xiii. 16, xv. 5, xxii. 17, to which also Jacob refers in his prayer, Gen. xxxii. 13, and so, indeed, that the לֹא יִמָּנֶה is taken from Gen. xiii. 16, and לֹא יִסָּפֵר מֵרֹב, from xxxii. 13, not from xvi. 10, where a very numerous posterity is promised to Hagar in the same terms. On the distinction of מָנָה, to determine, and סָפַר, to count, comp. Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bileams p. 91 ff.—V. 9. לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ, a heart hearkening to the voice of God, that is, obedient, docile.—"To judge thy people." For the decision of difficult cases, which in those days came immediately before the king, great discrimination and experience were requisite in order to distinguish at once right from wrong, and pass a just sentence.

Vv. 10—14. The prayer of Solomon related entirely to his office, to his position as king and administrator of law among the people of God; for himself personally he had asked nothing, neither long life, nor riches, nor the fall of his enemies (נֶפֶשׁ אֹיְבֶיךָ)—clear goods, which are often sought in this world as the greatest treasure. His prayer therefore pleased the Lord, and was heard in richer measure than he had asked. God grants him not only a wise and understanding heart, so that no king either before or after him surpassed him in wisdom; but also, in accordance with the promise that to him that seeks first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, all other things are added (Matth. vi. 33), gives him all earthly blessings in great abundance; riches and honour, and on the condition of obedience to his commands, promises him long life also.—V. 11. לִשְׁמֹעַ מִשְׁפָּט "to hear judgment." מִשְׁפָּט denotes the objective, the Divine judgment—to understand this, and practice it in the administration of justice.—The words: "that there was none like thee before thee," should not be limited with Cler. and others to the *reges Israelis,* which is arbitrary, but must be understood quite generally of all men, comp. iv. 29—32. בַּמְּלָכִים v. 13 is

also to be taken generally of all antecedent kings, all of whom he surpassed in riches and glory.—The promise of long life is only conditionally given (v. 14), and was not fulfilled, because Solomon failed in the condition, comp. xi. 42.

V. 15. On awaking, Solomon remarked that it was a dream, that is, a Divine vision in a dream, as Theodor. rightly explains. After his return to Jerusalem therefore he thanks the Lord for this promise by presenting burnt-offerings and thank-offerings before the ark of the covenant, and celebrates a sacrificial feast with his servants, that is, with his whole court.

Vv. 16—28. In proof that God had heard the prayer of Solomon by the bestowment of wisdom in judgment, a judicial decision in a difficult case is here related which demonstrates Solomon's extraordinary sagacity in judging. *Ἐπιδεῖξαι τὴν τοῦ βασίλεως ἐβουλήθη σοφίαν. σοφωτάτης γὰρ τῷ ὄντι διανοίας, τὸ τὰ λανθάνοντα δεῖξαι καὶ τὰ κεκρυμμένα δηλῶσαι, καὶ προσενεγκεῖν τῇ φύσει τὴν βάσανον καὶ αὐτῇ τῆς δίκης ἐπιτρέψαι τὴν ψῆφον.* Theodor.—Of two harlots inhabiting one house in common, each had a child, and the one overlaid her child during the night in sleep, laid her dead child in the bosom of the other, and took to herself the living one. Now when the other, on the next morning, attentively considered the child found dead in her bosom, she discovered that it was not her own, but that of the former, whereas this one asserted the contrary. Whereupon, having got into a controversy, they bring the matter before Solomon for decision, who takes the most effectual means in this case of bringing out the truth by commanding to divide the living child with the sword, and give a half to each, and thereby appealing to the love of the maternal heart which immediately discovers itself in this, that the real mother is more willing to yield up her child to the other than allow it to be divided in two.[1] כִּי נִכְמְרוּ רַחֲמֶיהָ Luther renders strikingly as to the sense; "for her motherly heart burned for her son." רַחֲמִים bowels, among the Hebrews, the seat of feeling, here *meton.* the tender mother love.—V. 28. This sentence made the impression on the

[1] A similar decision is recorded of the emperor Claudius. *Feminam non agnoscentem filium suum, dubia utrimque argumentorum fide, ad confessionem compulit indicto matrimonio juvenis. Sueton. vit. Claud c.* 15.

whole people, that Solomon was endowed with Divine wisdom for the administration of justice.[1]

# CHAPTER IV.

## LIST OF SOLOMON'S MOST DISTINGUISHED OFFICERS OF COURT AND STATE.

Older expositors have already observed, that this list belongs not to the beginning but to the later period of Solomon's reign. This appears certain from the fact that two of the twelve officers were married to daughters of Solomon, vv. 11—15. Besides it is scarcely probable, that all the ministers of state here enumerated should have held their office during a whole reign of forty years. The list appears accordingly to contain a collection of the most distinguished officers of the kingdom during the whole of Solomon's reign, which is inserted here for substantial reasons to give an idea of the power and glory of the kingdom of Israel under Solomon. To this both the commencement and close of the chapter point.

V. 1 contains a form of transition. "Solomon was king over all Israel." This implies no opposition to David, who reigned seven years over Judah alone (Münster); in that case, according to 2 Sam. v. 5, the whole would certainly have been expressed by Israel and Judah. There might rather be in the expression a reference to the division of the kingdom which took place after Solomon's death, though this also is rendered uncertain by chap. xii. 20, "they made Jeroboam king over all

[1] While the older theologians acknowledge the wisdom of this sentence, and even Niemeyer (Charakteristik d. Bib. iv. p. 536) finds in it an evidence of "quick decision, presence of mind, and correct knowledge of human nature," G. L. Bauer on the other hand (Gesch. d. hebr. Nat. ii. p. 289) sees therein "merely the conduct of an Oriental despot, a freak which would not very much exalt a European prince." Such a judgment only proves the inability of all rationalism, measuring according to its own ephemeral wisdom, to form an estimate of history.

Israel, only the tribe of Judah alone adhered to the house of David.

Vv. 2—6. The highest officers of the kingdom. שָׂרִים, princes, that is, supreme officers. Azariah the son of Zadok was הַכֹּהֵן. The Vulg., Luth., C. a Lap., Calm., J. D. Mich., and others consider הכהן the *genit. in app.* with צדוק, *filius Zadok* sacerdotis, for which only the want of the ו in the beginning of v. 4 can be pleaded. But against it is *(a)* the distinctive accent on צדוק, *(b)* the comparison with בֶּן־אֲחִילוּד הַמַּזְכִּיר v. 3, where the accent is the same and המזכיר is predicate, comp. Pfaff, *not. crit. ad h. c.* הכהן therefore must also be taken as predicate. Many regard Azariah as the son of Ahimaaz and grandson of Zadok, 1 Chr. v. 34, 35, which is very unlikely, comp. on ii. 27. In no case is he identical with the Azariah of 1 Chr. v. 36 (Seb. Schm.), as the latter lived under Uzziah, comp. my apalog. Vers. p. 180. But what does הַכֹּהֵן mean hear? Does it denote the high priest? Certainly not. For Zadok and Abiathar are named (v. 4) as the chief high priests, and Zadok officiates in the anointing of Solomon as high priest, i. 39. כֹּהֵן can here denote no priest, however strongly many critics from prejudice against Chronicles in 1 Chr. xviii. 15 will claim this meaning for the word everywhere, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 346 ff. and Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 301 ff.; but signifies the regent or representative of the king to the people—a meaning which is sufficiently established by ver. 5 and by the Arab. الكَاهِنُ which Tiruzabadi explains: *qui assurgit in negotio alicujus et operam dat in causa ejus*, see Ges. *thes.* ii. 661.[1]—V. 3.

[1] This passage refutes also the explanation of Stähelin in Tholuck's litt. Anz. 1838, No. 67, that כֹּהֲנִים, 2 Sam. viii. 18, denotes higher officers, to whom certain priestly functions of a lower kind were assigned, or as Gesen. *l. c. p.* 661, expresses it: *sacerdotes, fortasse sacra privata administrantes*; for such a priest could not have been distinguished by the definite article. Besides, Movers, in p. q. has already rejected the meaning obtruded on that passage of "house or palace priests," "court chaplains and spiritual advisers," as a new-fashioned application of our relations to the ancient world, whereas the remark, that Movers was *ejus quæ sacerdotum in aula Persarum et Aegyptiorum erat conditionis immemor (Gesen. l. c.)* is quite inapposite,

בְּנֵי שִׁישָׁא, Shisha is without doubt the same with שַׁוְשָׁא, 1 Chr. xviii. 16, who discharged the office of a Sopher under David, and 2 Sam. viii. 17 is called שְׂרָיָה.[1] סֹפְרִים, scribes, secretaries to the king,[2] comp. 2 Sam. viii. 17, xx. 25; 2 Ki. xii. 11, xix. 2, xxii. 3 ff.—Jehoshaphat the son of Ahilud was מַזְכִּיר, annalist under David (2 Sam. viii. 16)—a higher officer, who is found in all oriental kingdoms, among the ancient and modern Persians (*Waka Nuwish)*, with the Eastern Roman emperors, even among the Chinese, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 415.—V. 4. Concerning Benaiah, Zadok, and Abiathar, comp. i. 18, and ii. 27. It is remarkable

because in heathen states the priests stood in quite a different relation to the kings, who were often taken from the priestly caste, or were at the same time *summi pontifices*, from that in the theocracy, in which the direct contrary of the *intima inter munus regium et sacerdotale necessitudo* asserted by Gesen. took place, so that sons of the king could not be admitted into the priesthood, which was exclusively assigned to the tribe of Levi.

[1] The statement of Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 38, concerning these names is quite erroneous. The whole 18th chap. of 1 Chr. is parallel to 2 Sam. viii., so that the last part of 1 Chr. xviii. 16, cannot be formed from 2 Sam. xx. 25. With this agrees at the same time the conjecture, that שַׁוְשָׁא has arisen by change of letters from שְׁיָא 2 Sam. xx. 25, which in all probability is itself only a corruption of שְׂרָיָה, 2 Sam. viii. 17.

[2] Preceded by J. D. Mich. (Mos. R. iii. § 176) Studer. Comm. on Judges v. 14, asserts that "סֹפֵר denotes such military officers as preside over the levying and mustering of troops." This is incapable of proof, at least for the times of David and Solomon; for not only is the enumeration of the people, undertaken by David for military purposes (2 Sam. xxiv; 1 Chr. xxi.), effected by the captains of the host, and the commander-in-chief Joab, but the *term. techn.* for the mustering of the people is not סָפַר, but פָּקַד, comp. 1 Sam. xxiv. 2, 4, 9; 1 Chr. xxi. 5, 6; 2 Chr. xxvi. 11. There is also no indication in any of these places that סֹפֵר denotes a military officer. On the contrary the numbering of the people under Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 11) was effected by Jeiel the Sopher and Maaseiah the Shoter, under the direction of Hananiah. But even here it is still uncertain, whether the Sopher was a military officer, as a Shoter is joined with him, to whom the keeping of the family register of the people belonged, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 196 ff.—First under Zedekiah is the סֹפֵר expressly called שַׂר הַצָּבָא, who mustered the people of the land for military service, 2 Ki. xxv. 19; Jer. xxv. 52, comp. with xxxvii. 15.—From the poetical passages, Judg. v. 14, Is. xxxiii. 18, nothing can be ascertained concerning the office of Sopher.

that the high-priest Abiathar, who was deposed in the very beginning of Solomon's reign (ii. 35) is still mentioned here among the officers of the kingdom. To assume, with Cler., that Solomon afterwards forgave him, is devoid of all probability. The best explanation might be the assumption of Theodoret: τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφείλετο, οὐ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐγύμνωσεν· τὴν γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀξίαν οὐκ ἐκ χειροτονίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ γονικῆς εἶχον διαδοχῆς, to which not only *Proc. Gaz.*, as usual, but also *Calvin.* assents, whereas the conjectures of *Vatabl.* and *Grot.*, that he was the suffragan of the high priest, and of *Mich. Deres.* and others, that he continued second priest in rank, are quite unsupported. V. 5. הַנִּצָּבִים, are the prefects enumerated from v. 7.—כֹּהֵן before רֵעַ הַמֶּלֶךְ cannot be in apposition with נָתָן, because it has no article, but is predicate and is explained by רע המלך: Zabud the son of Nathan was *Kohen*, regent, that is, "friend of the king," probably privy-counsellor of the king.—V. 6. Ahishar was עַל־הַבַּיִת governor of the palace, minister of the royal court, xvi. 9; 2 Ki. xviii. 18; Is. xxii. 15.—Adoniram here and v. 8 is identical with Adoram, 2 Sam. xx. 24; 1 Ki. xii. 18, or Hadoram, 2 Chr. x. 18, and was overseer of the socagers (הַמַּס). Concerning the derivation and fundamental meaning of the word מַס opinions are much divided. It is scarcely necessary to mention the derivation from مَشَّ, *mulsit*, proposed by Mich. (*Suppl. ad lex. hebr. s.v.*), which is not in the remotest degree connected with the usual meaning of מַס. Equally untenable is the derivation maintained after Kimchi (*lib. rad.*) by Buxtorf, Winer, and lastly by Studer on Judg. i. 28 from מָסַס *liquefactus, dissolutus est;* for מַס means neither *viribus attritus* nor *liquefactio (animi)* even in the passage cited by Win. and Rosenm. Is. xxxi. 8, comp. Hitzig and Ew. on it. Still less can מִסָּה, measure, Deut. xvi. 10 be explained from this etymology. Even the derivation attempted by Ges. in the *thes.* ii. 703 by contraction of מֶכֶס from כסס, according to which the primary meaning of מַס would be *vectigal*, is justly objected to by *Jul. Fürst: Errant magnopere, qui hoc nomen ex n.* מֶכֶס *(a. r.* כסס *vi numerandi computandive) correptum esse putant. Concord. V. T. p.* 690. Still even the

derivation proposed by *Fürst* himself from a root "מס *cui æquale est* מד *inde emollitum, vi metiendi, unde* מס *res, quæ metiendo definitur*," and the combining of this root with μισθὸς, μοῖτος, Goth. *mizdo*, Isl. *muta*, Germ. *Mauth*, O. H. G. *matu*, have at least the Hebrew usage against them. For in Hebrew מַס nowhere signifies *vectigal*, tribute or socage, as is still asserted in the latest lexicons, but without exception in all places only serf or socager. The use of the term exclusively of persons was observed by Cocceius in his lexicon; *ita dicuntur, qui—ad opus servile faciendum conscribuntur.* In most passages it is so obvious that citation is unnecessary, and cannot be mistaken even in Lam. i. 1 and Prov. xii. 24, where it has not been observed by Marcy. In the former passage Jerusalem is personified: "the mistress among the nations, the princess among the cities becomes a bond maid." In the latter Ew. has already observed the personification, "But slothfulness must serve." But Esth. x. 1 is not to be quoted to the contrary, because here the Chaldee usage prevails, and in Chaldee and Rabbinic מס unquestionably means *vectigal*, according to derivative not original usage. On the socager comp. v. 27.

Vv. 7—19. Here the twelve prefects are named, who were appointed over all Israel to provide the royal household with victuals. These are not with Mich. to be taken for exchequer officers, who managed the crown lands, for such are mentioned under David, 1 Chr. xxvii. 25 ff., and otherwise designated, but, as Rosenm. expresses it, general collectors of income, who levied the royal revenues, which, according to Chardin, in the East consist mostly of raw material, that is, fruits and products of the land, not as in the West of cash payments, and delivered them into the royal kitchen (A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 166.) כִּלְכֵּל *alimenta suppeditavit*, see the Lexx.—חֹדֶשׁ בַּשָּׁנָה וגו׳, that is, it lay upon each to provide for the supply of one month in the year.—The districts under the several prefects correspond only partly with the territories of the tribes, as the land was probably divided among them according to its greater or less fertility.

V. 8. "The son of Hur"[1] was set over Mount Ephraim. This

[1] Of the names of these prefects it is striking, that five have no proper names, but are designated only as "Son of Hur, Son of Dekar,"

oft-mentioned mountain of middle Palestine, (Jos. xvii. 15, ff. xix. 50, xx. 7; Judg. ii. 9, iii. 17, iv. 5, &c.), extended from the plain of Esdraelon down towards Jerusalem, where the mountains of Judah began, and belonged to the most cultivated parts of Palestine, rich in fruitful valleys and slopes intersected and watered by brooks, with well-wooded ridges and grassy plains, (Jer. l. 19.)[1] In this passage the country of Benjamin is excluded, as Shimei the son of Elah was placed over it, v. 18.

V. 9. Among the places here named, Makaz, only mentioned in this passage, is entirely unknown, comp. *Relandi Pal. illustr. p.* 170 and 882, but is certainly to be sought for in the tribe of Dan, to which the remaining places belong. Shaalbim (שַׁעַלְבִים, identical with שַׁעַלַבִּים, Jos. xix. 42; Judg. i. 35), also no farther known, is in the tribe of Dan, comp. *Rel. l. c. p.* 988.—Bethshemesh, a city of priests on the borders of Dan and Judah and the Philistines, (Jos. xv. 11, xxi. 6; 1 Sam. vi. 12—15; 1 Chr. vi. 59), according to Eusebius, ten Roman miles distant from Eleutheropolis in the direction of Nicopolis, is, notwithstanding Reland's contradiction, (*l. c. p.* 656), identical with Irshemesh, which, Jos. xix. 41, was assigned to the Danites, but, as it lay on

&c., vv. 8—11, 13, whereas to the others special proper names are given besides this patronymic designation. Not without ground, therefore, Cler. and Mich. supposed that the names of the former had fallen out of the text. *Nec solent nomina parentum, omisso proprio, proferri nisi singulari de causa, ut quando iratus est qui loquitur, nec præ indignatione nomen invisi hominibus proferre vult, sic David ab irato Saulo aliquoties* Jisais filius *dicitur*, 1 Sam. xx. 27, 30, xxii. 7, 8, 9, 13. Cler. Comp. therewith the son of Remaliah Is. vii. 4, and Ges. Com. thereon. There is a temptation, certainly, to regard the words themselves as *nomina propria compos.*—Benhur, Bendekar, &c., after the analogy of Benhanan, 1 Chr. iv. 2, &c. But against this is not merely the circumstance, that the LXX. and Josephus regarded the words as *patronym.*—*υἱὸς Ὢρ, υἱὸς Δακάρ*, &c. (LXX.), and Ὄυρης, Δακῆρος, &c. (Jos.)—but still more decidedly the phrase Ben-Abinadab, v. 11, which cannot possibly be a *nom. prop. compos.* No other expedient, therefore, remains but to assume the *nom. propr.* has fallen out of the text, though this assumption in so many names is doubtful.

[1] Comp. v. Raumer, Palest. p. 43, Winer bibl. R.W. i. p. 392. The chief ridge of the southern part of the mountain chain forms the western boundary of Ephraim and Benjamin, and the border between it and the mountains of Judah in the south constitutes the great wady Beit Hanina, comp. Robins. Pal. ii. p. 587 and Thenius in Käuffer's bibl. stud. ii. p. 142.

the borders, was seized by the tribe of Judah and given to the Levites. For Irshemesh and Harheres, which is identical with it, (see Studer on Judg. i. 35), are mentioned together with Ajalon and Shaalbim, Jos. xix. 41 f., and Judg. i. 35, as Bethshemesh and Ajalon in Josh. xix. 42, 43. Robinson has discovered it again in the ruins of Ain-Shems, (Pal. iii. p. 224 ff.). Elon (אֵילוֹן different from אַיָּלוֹן, Jos. xix. 42 f.), is rendered more definite by the epithet Bethhanan, but it is to us quite unknown. Many take Bethhanan for a separate place, supplying וְ, whereas *Chald.* and *Syr.* repeat both names as referring to the one place, while the LXX. (ἕως Βηθανάν) is of too free a character to prove anything.

V. 10. Aruboth, which occurs nowhere else, must have been situated in Judah from its connexion with Sochoh. שֹׂכֹה. Two Sochohs lay in the tribe of Judah, both of which still exist under the name of Shuweikeh, Rob. Pal. ii. p. 370; the one on the mountains of Judah, (Jos. xv. 48), south of Hebron in the wady of Khulil, for which compare Rob. i. p. q. 421 ff.; the other in the plain of Judah on the border of the Philistines, nine Roman miles from Eleutheropolis towards Jerusalem, Jos. xv. 35; 1 Sam. xvii. 1—3, comp. Rob. ii. p. 598 f. and 606 f., and Thenius i. p. q. p. 151. The latter is in all probability the one here mentioned. The land of Hepher, the territory of a king conquered by Joshua, is certainly to be sought also in the plain of Judah; for, Jos. xii. 17, the King of Hepher is mentioned between the King of Tappuah[1] and that of Aphek, which is probably identical with the Philistine Aphek, (perhaps Ahbek احبك, Rob. ii. p. 589), in the neighbourhood of Ebenezer, (1 Sam. iv. 1), comp. Winer R. W. i. p. 79.—The land of Hepher is therefore quite

[1] Tappuah, in the plain of Judah, to all appearance in the neighbourhood of Zanoah, Jarmuth, Sochoh, &c. Jos. xv. 34 is different from Beth-tappuah, Jos. xv. 53, on the mountains of Judah, not far west of Hebron, now Teffuh, see Rob. ii. p. 700. But if the Tappuah, conquered by Joshua, (Jos. xii. 17), were to be sought on the mountains of Judah, and therefore were identical with Beth-tappuah, the conjecture above offered concerning the situation of the land of Hepher would not thereby be proved erroneous, as it by no means follows from Jos. xii. 17, that the land of Hepher was exactly in the neighbourhood of Tappuah.

different from גַּתָּה חֵפֶר, Jos. xix. 13, in Zebulon, which according to Talmudic statements in Reland, (*l. c. p.* 718 *sq.*), is to be sought not far from Sippori.

V. 11. כָּל־נָפַת דֹּאר, the whole hill country of Dor lay on the Mediterranean under the promontory of Carmel. The town of Dor, situated according to *Hieron. in nono milliario Cæsarea pergentibus Ptolemaidem* was the seat of a Canaanitish king, after the conquest of whom it was assigned to Manasseh (Jos. xii. 23, xvii. 11, &c.), in later times a bishop's see, at present a town of the name of *Tartura* or *Tortura*, perhaps طور دورا *mons Doræ*, comp. *Ges. Thes.* i. 331, Rosenm., bibl. Altthk. ii. 2, p. 323 ff., and v. Raumer, Pal. p. 152.

V. 12. *Taanach* and *Megiddo*, which are almost always named together, were Canaanitish royal cities, that were assigned by Joshua to the Manassites within the territory of Issachar (Jos. xii. 21, xvii. 11; Judg. i. 27, v. 19; 1 Chr. vii. 29), but were long unconquered, lay both on the Kishon, in the plain of Esdraelon, and are celebrated for several battles, Judg. v. 19; 2 Ki. ix. 27, xxiii. 29; 2 Chr. xxxv. 22, comp. v. Raumer, Pal. p. 130 f. Taanach is preserved in the small place Taannuk تعنّك, southeast of Megiddo, as v. Schubert, Travels in the East, iii. p. 164, and Rob., Pal. iii. p. 387, have observed, both of whom saw the place from a distance.—Megiddo is, according to Rob. i. p. q. p. 412 ff., identical with the old *Legio* of *Euseb.* and *Hieron.*, a name which still exists in the modern village *el Lejjun* in the great caravan road between Egypt and Damascus. From the importance of this situation, by which Megiddo formed the key to northern Palestine from the western lowlands, we see the reason why Solomon had it fortified, ix. 15.—כָּל־בֵּית שְׁאָן, "the whole district of Bethshean." The town Bethshean, likewise assigned to the Manassites in the territory of Issachar, in the southeast extremity of the plain Esdraelon, but long unconquered, so that even under Saul it belonged to the Philistines, Jos. xvii. 11 f.; 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, afterwards called Scythopolis,[1]

[1] Concerning the origin of the name Scythopolis, several conjectures have been offered. Following Reland *(l. c.)* Gesenius in the notes on Burkhardt's travels ii. p. 1058, from the neighbouring (?) Succoth;

comp. Reland *l. c. p.* 992 *sq.*, v. Raumer, Pal. p. 147 f., at present a village of seventy or eighty houses in the lower end of the valley of Jezreel, where it joins the valley of Jordan, under the name of Beisan, see Rob. iii. p. 407 ff. The district of Bethshean extends "by Zartanah beneath Jezreel from (the town) Bethshean to Abel-meholah," which lay in the valley of Jordan ten Roman miles south of Scythopolis, comp. Rosenm. bibl. Alterthsk. ii. 2 p. 131 f. The words "beneath Jezreel" are explained by the high situation of Jezreel, at present called Zerin, of which Rob. iii. p. 394 says, Zerin itself lies comparatively high, and commands a wide and glorious prospect, which extends

*Succothpolis* corrupted into *Skythopolis*. Quite improbable, as Succoth lies on the farther side of Jordan (see on vii. 46), and there is no conceivable reason why a town lying on this side of Jordan should have been denominated from the remote Succoth on the other side. More may be said for the opinion propounded by *Euseb. Chron.* i. 40, *Plinius, hist. nat.* v. 16, *Gregor. Sync.* p. 214, that the place received this name from the irruption of the Scythians into Palestine narrated by Herodotus, *l.* i. 103—105, for which recently Hitzig. Kl. proph. p. 234, and Bertheau, in the Gesch. d. Isr. p. 362, have warmly declared themselves. But very weighty grounds are against it. Rosenm. (bibl. Altthk. ii. 2, p. 107) justly contended, that, as several centuries elapsed between this irruption of the Scythians into Palestine, and the time when the Greek language became usual in that country, it is in the highest degree improbable that the Greeks should have named this town after a people who had so long before dwelt there only for a short time. The rise of this name, however, occurs first in the time after the Maccabees, as the addition in the LXX. to Judg. i. 27: Βαιθσὰν ἥ ἐστι Σκυθῶν πόλις, has been rightly recognized by Reland *l. c.* as a later gloss, comp. Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 599.—Still more decisive is the fact, that the Scythians—as is perfectly consistent with the account of Herodotus, comp. Strauss, *vat. Zeph. p.* xviii. *sqq.*—can in no case have penetrated or ruled over Palestine on this side of the Jordan in the years 629—588 B.C., because Jeremiah knows no other enemy occupying this land than Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans, comp. Kueper, *Jerem. libr. ss. interpr.* p. 13, and Straus *l. c.* Consequently they cannot have taken and occupied Bethshean. Hävern. in p. q. is the first to discover the true derivation of the name. It owes its origin to the interpretation of Gog (Ezek. xxxviii. and xxxix.), as the Scythians, whose overthrow, according to an interpretation of Ezek. xxxix. 11, already found in the *Chald.*, took place in the valley of the fords of the Jordan, east of the sea of Gennesareth. On the ground of this interpretation, the Hellenistic Jews applied the name Scythopolis to Bethshean, a town situated in the neighbourhood of this valley, as, according to Ezek xxxix. 16, a name of a town in this neighbourhood was to be a memorial of that catastrophe.

down the broad valley underneath eastward to Beisan and the mountains of Bashan on the other side of the Jordan, comp. farther p. 399.—The words מֵעֵבֶר לְיָקְמְעָם beyond Jokmeam can scarcely be regarded as a more precise description of Abel-Meholah, but must certainly describe the south-western border of the district assigned to Baanah. Jokmeam, a Levitical town in Ephraim (1 Chr. vi. 53), which is also called Kibzaim (Jos. xxi. 22), is so unknown, that neither Rosenm. and v. Raumer, in their biblical geographies, nor Winer in his Cyclop., and Gesen. in his *thes.*, mention the name, and even Reland *l. c. p.* 864 only remarks on it: *hanc in Ephraim vulgo locant.*

V. 13. Ramoth Gilead, called also רָאמוֹת בַּגִּלְעָד, Jos. xx. 8, רָמַת הַמִּצְפֶּה and מִצְפֵּה גִלְעָד Judg. xi. 29, a Levitical and free town in the north border of Gad (Deut. iv. 43; Jos. xxi. 38) in which Jepthah dwelt, must have been situated, according to Gesenius' conjecture in Burkhardt's trav. ii., p. 1061 and v. Raumer's Pal. 257, on the site of the present Salt (الصلت in Abulfeda *Tab. Syr.* p. 92) in the province of Belka, concerning which comp. Rosenm. in p. q. p. 33. To the circuit of the Son of Geber belonged also the residence (חַוֹּת) of Zair in Gilead, "the region of Argob in Bashan, three score great cities with walls and brazen bars."[1] The more specific determination of this circuit depends on this, whether the region of Argob is different from Havoth Jair, or identical with it, only another designation for it. The diversity, for which v. Raumer lastly in the learned treatise on Judea east of the Jordan in Tholuck's litt. Anz. 1834 No. 1, 2, also in his Palest., p. 225, and Hävern., Einl. i. 2, p. 516 f. have declared themselves, might be favoured by the appended description, found only in this place, namely, Havoth Jair in Gilead, and Argob in Bashan. But against this exposition is the want of the וְ copulative before חבל, which

[1] The description of these towns borrowed from Deut. iii. 4, 5, "with walls and brazen bars," finds a sufficient explanation in the state of that country. Even now travellers meet with innumerable walled towns in the district of the Old Bashan, and the prevailing basalt formation of the country, so that C. Ritter made the conjecture, that by the brazen bars basalt gates might be understood, comp. v. Raumer in Tholuck's litt. Anz. 1834, p. 6 f.

must be regarded as a proof of identity, since different places are throughout this section connected with one another by ו and, see vv. 8, 12, 16. This appears still more evidently from the comparison of this verse with the passage on which it is based, Deut. iii. 4, according to which the region of Argob, with its sixty strong towns, constituted the kingdom of Og in Bashan, especially with vv. 13, 14, "And the rest of Gilead and all Bashan, being the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manasseh; all the region of Argob with all Bashan.—Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi; and called them, namely, Bashan, after his own name Havoth-Jair unto this day." If we farther compare with this the description of the district of Manasseh, Jos. xiii. 30, 31,—"all Bashan, all the kingdom of Og king of Bashan, and all Havoth Jair, which are in Bashan, threescore cities; and half Gilead and Ashtaroth and Edrei, the cities of the kingdom of Og in Bashan, (gave he) to the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh; no doubt can remain, that the Havoth Jair are identical with the region of Argob as well as with the country of Bahan and the sixty strong towns were in Bashan, as Hengstenb. (Beitr. iii. p. 227 ff.) in harmony with Welte (Nachmosaisches im Pent. p. 172 ff.) has proved.[1] If this is established, the region of Argob cannot, as v. Raumer and Hävern. in p. q. think, be confined to the western half of old Bashan,

[1] The identity of the Havoth Jair with the sixty towns of the region of Argob in Bashan, which flows so naturally from these passages and was therefore recognised even by Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 1 p. 279 ff., would not have been so much apprehended, had not only twenty-three Havoth Jair been mentioned in 1 Chr. ii. 22, and afterwards Judg. x. 3, thirty sons of a later Jair as possessor of thirty Havoth Jair in Gilead; whence v. Raumer and Hävern. i. p. q. conclude, that the twenty-three Havoth Jair, that were afterwards increased by seven, are different from the sixty towns in Bashan, that are also called Havoth Jair in the Pentateuch and Joshua. But that these twenty-three Havoth Jair (1 Chr. ii. 23), that were wrested from the descendants of Jair by the Geshurites and Aramæans, but conquered again by the sons of Jair the Judge and increased by seven, by which in the period of the judges the name Havoth Jair revived and received a new significance, belong to the sixty strong towns in Bashan and form a part of them, Hengstenb. i. p. q. has so cogently demonstrated, that Welte i. p. q. simply contents himself with appropriating the result of this investigation.

that is, Gaulanitis (Jaulan), but must comprise at the same time the eastern half of it, Auranitis and Trachonitis, or Hauran together with a part of Lejah. For Bashan extended eastward "unto Salchah," northward "unto Mount Hermon and the border of Geshuri (Jeidur) and Maachathi" (at the sources of the Jordan), Deut. iii. 10; Jos. xii. 4, 5; comp. v. Raumer, Pal. p. 224 f.[1] From the identity of the Havoth Jair and the region Argob it farther follows, *(a)* that the name Gilead is here used in the wider sense of the whole east-jordanic territory of the Israelites, and thus includes Bashan,[2] as in Num. xxxii. 39; Deut. xxxiv. 1; Jos. xxii. 9, 13; Judg. v. 17, x. 4, xx. 1; 2 Ki. x. 33; 1 Chr. ii. 23, &c.; comp. *Relandi Pal. ill. p.* 194, v. Raumer Pal. p. 209 f.—*(b)* that חַוֹּת cannot with Cler. on Num. xxxii. 41, Rosenm. bibl. Altthk. ii. 1 p. 279, and Faber, Archæol. i. p. 158 be derived from the Arab. حِوَاءٌ *tabernaculum ex lana vel pilis caprinis, quale Arabum campestrium esse solet.* For strong towns with walls and brazen gates and bars cannot possibly have received their name from Nomade tents. Rightly therefore has Gesenius *(thes.* i. 451) returned to the derivation already given by Serrarius and others from חָוָה *vivere alicubi*, which is confirmed by its identity with חַיָּה 2 Sam. xxiii. 13, which was recognised by Kimchi *(Lex)*, rejected indeed by Gesen. *l. c. p.* 470, but again brought forward with good reason by Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 232. חַוָּה and חַיָּה, however, signify neither village, town, encampment, much less tent-circuit,

[1] Studer on Judges p. 268 concludes indeed from this text and from Deut. iii. 13, Jos. xiii. 30, that the region Argob was situated in Bashan and composed therefore only a part of it. But the expression, the kingdom of Og in Bashan (Deut.) or the kingdom of Og king in Bashan (Jos.) is explained by the circumstance, that the kingdom of Og, who was properly king of Bashan, extended beyond Bashan over a part of Gilead. According to these more distinct statements, the less definite expression of these passages "region of Argob in Bashan" is to be explained.

[2] The words, "region of Argob in Bashan," therefore, are to be regarded as the more definite counterpart of the "Havoth Jair in Gilead." The לוֹ before חֶבֶל corresponds to the לוֹ before חַוֹּת and cannot with Kanne bibl. Unters. und Ausleg. ii., p. 122, be referred to Jair; "Ben-geber had the Havoth of Jair, to whom belonged the region of Argob," but to בֶּן גֶּבֶר.

camp,—as Böttcher, Prob. Alttest. Schrifterkl. p. 84 asserts from etymological absurdities—but abodes, properly Jair's life.[1]—חֶבֶל אַרְגֹּב, the word חבל to denote a region is borrowed from the Pentateuch and elsewhere occurs only in poetry, Zeph. ii. 5, 6. ארגב the *Targ.* explain טְרָכוֹנָא Trachonitis, which corresponds to the etymology from רְגֹב stone-heap as well as the nature of the country, if we assume, that the name is derived from the north-east part of Hauran, which has received its Greek name *Τραχωνῖτις*, as well as its Arabic one اللجاة Lejah from its stony soil which is covered with heaps of rocky fragments (s. Burkh. Trav. 1, p. 196 and p. 16), comp. Studer i. p. q. p. 268.[2]

V. 14. Mahanaim (double camp according to Gen. xxxii. 2) beyond Jordan, north of the Jabbok on the borders of Gad and Manasseh, originally assigned to Gad, but given to the Levites, Jos. xxi. 38; 1 Chr. vi. 80; comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 1, p. 275, and v. Raumer, Pal. p. 243.[3]

[1] Seb. Schmidt *ad l. Jud. p.* 978 explains חַוֹּת as an Aramaic word. It is in favour of this, not only that even in the Mosaic times the forms חוה and הוה were almost entirely displaced by חיה and היה (see Hengstenb. Beitr. iii., p. 232), but also that according to Num. xxxii. 41 these towns were called חַוֹּת before they were taken possession of by the Israelites.

[2] This derivation should merit the preference over that proposed by Reland (*Pal. ill. p.* 201, 959) from the κώμη Αργόβ, which according to *Euseb. Onom.* lay fifteen Roman miles west (to the N.W. indeed) of Gerasa, and must have been called in his time 'Εργά (probably 'Εργαβά according to Rel.), and by Josephus (Antiq. xiii. 15, 5) named 'Ραγαβᾶ, which Burkhardt (Trav. i., p. 438) conjectures to be in the ruins of el Husn, on the east side of the Sea of Galilee, about an hour distant from it. Should this conjecture gain probability, we must assume in Eusebius an exchange of Gerasa with Gadara, other traces of which also occur in him, comp. v. Raumer Pal. p. 240, as Gerasa lies quite too far from el Husn in the south.

[3] According to this passage, as well as 2 Sam. ii. 8, 12, 19, Mahanaim must have been an important place. Perhaps the Jordan valley belonging to king Sihon from Jabbok to the Sea of Galilee (Jos. xii. 3) was attached to the circuit of Ahinadab.—Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 2, 3) assigns to him all Galilee as far as Sidon instead of Mahanaim. This is quite arbitrary, as Galilee consisted of the territories of Naphtali, Asher, Zebulon, and Issacher, of which each had its own prefect (vv. 15—17), except Zebulon, which was probably divided among the three mentioned in the text.

V. 16. וּבְעָלוֹת. The LXX., *Syr.* and *Arab.* give *Baaloth.* A place of this name lay in the tribe of Judah, Jos. xv. 24, which, however, cannot here be intended. And the בְּ is probably a prefix and the name Aloth, which, however, is completely unknown.

V. 19. "The country of Gilead, the country of Sihon king of the Amorites and of Og king of Bashan," denotes the whole tract east of Jordan, from Arnon to the neighbourhood of the Mandhur, which discharges itself into the Jordan near the Sea of Galilee. Gilead, strictly taken, was divided by the Jabbok into two parts, of which the southern, the present Belka, belonged to king Sihon, the northern, the present Ajlun, to the kingdom of Og of Bashan, Deut. iii. 13; Jos. xii. 2—5. But the whole tract of Gilead was not under Geber, the son of Uri. In the northern part of it the son of Geber (v. 13) was appointed over Ramoth, and Abinadab (v. 14) over Mahanaim. Geber's prefecture extended therefore over the territory of Reuben, Gad, and a small part of the half-tribe of Manasseh (Jos. xiii. 15 ff.)

V. 20. A remark made to extol the glory of Solomon's reign on the prosperity which the whole people enjoyed under it. The words, "Judah and Israel were many, as the sand which is by the sea," show that the promise made to Abraham, Gen. xxii. 17, comp. with xxxii. 13, was fulfilled. Comp. Rem. on iii. 8.—How the other part also of that promise, "and thy seed shall possess the gate of their enemies," was fulfilled, is shown chap. v. 1. "They ate and drank and made merry," denotes the great prosperity of the people. Comp. 1 Sam. xxx. 16.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### SOLOMON'S MIGHT, GLORY, AND WISDOM, V. 1—14. HIS LEAGUE WITH HIRAM, V. 15—32.

The first fourteen verses are connected with the previous chapter, to which also they are referred by the LXX., Vulgate, Luther, and others. V. 1 especially, as has been already inti-

mated, connects itself in the closest manner with iv. 20. With v. 15 a new section begins.

V. 1. "Solomon was ruler over all kingdoms from the river (Euphrates) over the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt." Before אֶרֶץ most expositors supply עַד from 2 Chr. ix. 26: "unto the land of the Philistines and unto the border of Egypt," in which case וְעַד גְּבוּל וגו must be regarded as explicative. But the chronicler may also have explained the passage by the insertion of וְעַד, and בְּ with de Wette and Maurer may be repeated in thought from the foregoing.—The first member of the verse, moreover, stands in obvious connection with the promise, Gen. xv. 18, while the second points to the fulfilment of Gen. xxii. 17.—מַגִּשִׁים depends on מַמְלָכוֹת by means of a *constructio ad sensum*. מִנְחָה present is a mild expression for tribute, Judg. iii. 15—17; 2 Sam. viii. 2; 2 Ki. xvii. 3, 4; 2 Chr. xvii. 11, xxvi. 8; Ps. xlv. 13, lxviii. 30, lxxii. 10. Comp. Harmar, Beob. ü. d. Orient. iii. p 164.

Vv. 2—8. Expenditure of the royal household; *(a)* for the royal kitchen, vv. 2, 3; *(b)* for the mews, vv. 6—8.—לֶחֶם provisions, victuals. The supply here stated was not destined for the royal table alone, but for the whole court, for the many royal consorts, his numerous attendants, body-guards, and all who, according to Oriental custom, received their maintenance from the royal court (כָּל־הַקָּרֵב וגו v. 7).—"30 cors of bolted wheaten meal, and 60 cors of meal." סֹלֶת is here distinguished from קֶמַח, whereas, Gen. xviii. 6, both words are connected, and קֶמַח is more exactly defined by סֹלֶת. סֹלֶת means the finest bolted wheaten meal, סֹלֶת חִטִּים Ex. xxix. 2. The etymology of the word is uncertain, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 959, and *Fürstii Concord. p.* 768.—כֹּר Cor,[1] a measure of dry and liquid things,

[1] As the cor, besides the present passage and v. 25, occurs only again in 2 Chr. ii. 9, xxvii. 5; Ezek. xlv. 14, it belongs to the later speech-usage. And therefore the Hebrews appear to have adopted it from the Arameans, since the *Chald.* and *Syr.* in Lev. xxvii. 16, Is. v. 10, render חֹמֶר by כּוּרָא, ܟܘܪܐ. In Arabic also is found كُرّ and it has passed from the Shemites to the Hellenists,

v. 25, containing ten baths or ephahs, Ezek. xlv. 15, and therefore for dry goods equal to the homer (Ezek. xlv. 11), which, according to Josephus (*Antiq.* xv. 9, 2) was equivalent to 10 Attic *μέδιμνοι*, according to Böckh's metrol. Untersuch. containing 19,857.7 Par. cub. inches ,or 7,398,000 Par. grains of water, comp. Bertheau, on the hist. of Isr. p. 73.—V. 3. The number of cattle slain daily—10 fattened oxen, 20 from the pastures, that is, such as were taken immediately from grazing, and 100 sheep—is not too great in comparison with that which is used in other oriental courts. According to Athenæus (*Deipnos. l.* iv. *c.* 10), 1000 oxen daily were slaughtered for the kings of Persia, and Tavernier relates that as many as 500 sheep and lambs were daily consumed for the court of the Sultan, see Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 169* f. In the case of Solomon, however, several kinds of game are added. יַחְמוּר, ἔλαφος πλατύκερως or εὐρύκερως (Opp. Cyneget. ii. 293), the hart, which is still found by modern travellers on Tabor and Carmel, comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. iv. 2, p. 177 ff. —בַּרְבֻּרִים אֲבוּסִים, fattened poultry. Concerning אבוס, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 17. The *Chald.*, *Syr.*, *Arab.* and *Vulg.* render ברברים by fowl or poultry, Kimchi, *capones*; Ges. (*thes.* i. 246) conjectures geese, but quite uncertainly. Moreover the word must at all events have denoted a particular kind of poultry as the Hebrews use צִפֳּרִים for poultry in general, Neh. v. 18.[1]

Vv. 4, 5. כִּי, for. Solomon might expend so much on his court, for he was lord, &c., and (v. 5) the whole people of Israel enjoyed the blessings of peace during his whole reign. כָּל־עֵבֶר הַנָּהָר, the whole region on that side the river (Euphrates) denotes here, not, as might be expected, the country east of the Euphrates, but that lying west of this river, because the author

*κορός*, Lev. xxvii. 16; Num. xi. 32, &c. (LXX.); Ex. viii. 14 in *Aquil* and *Symm.* comp. *Schleussneri Lex. in LXX. interp. s. v.* and, and in the New Testament, Luk. xvi. 7.

[1] Bochart in *hieroz.* II. *l.* i. *c.* 19, treats very largely of this word. But his explanation, *altilia lectissima*, is, irrespective of other grounds, grammatically inadmissible, because it makes אבוסים a substantive, and ברברים an adjective, whereby the substantive, contrary to the speech-usage (see Ew. Gr. § 537) would stand after the adjective.

takes his position from the Chaldee empire, and from the centre of this empire defines the boundaries of Solomon's kingdom;[1] for the dominion of Solomon extended only to the Euphrates. The north-eastern boundary was formed by תִּפְסַח, *(trajectus)* Thapsacus, a great and wealthy town on the west bank of the Euphrates, at which the armies of the younger Cyrus and Alexander crossed the Euphrates, (*Xenoph. Anab.* i. 4, *Arrian exp. Al.* iii. 7), in Pliny's time called *Amphipolis* (hist. nat. v. 21—24), comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. p. 461.—The south-west boundary was formed by Gaza, a city of the Philistines, an hour distant from the Mediterranean, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 636 ff.—V. 5. The phrase, "to sit under his own vine and his own figtree," denotes the *summa et laetissima tranquillitas in amœna omnium copia*, 2 Ki. xviii. 31, and is therefore employed by the prophets to depict the Messianic prosperity and peace, Mic. iv. 4; Zech. iii. 10.—"From Dan. to Beersheba" is the standing designation of the whole country from north to south since the period of the

[1] The same usage of speech we find in Ezr. iv. 16, vi. 6, 7, 21, 25, viii. 36; Neh. ii. 7, whence we are not to conclude, that the author of the Books of Kings lived in the exile beyond the Euphrates, but only that he lived in the time of the great Chaldee empire. The well-known observation, that in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua especially, עֵבֶר, מֵעֵבֶר, are used of Palestine as well on this side as on the other side of Jordan, which the Nealogian critics employed to prove the spuriousness of the Pentateuch, and the composition of the Book of Joshua during the exile, has occasioned two fundamental investigations concerning the usage of these words, by M. Drechsler, unwissenschaftlichkeit im Geb. d. Alttest. Kritik, p. 148—166, and by Hengstenberg, Beitr. iii. p. 313—324, which, however, do not fully solve the problem when taken separately, but must be united together. For the distinction assumed by Hengstenberg between the subjective and the objective historical speech-usage is not sufficient, as B. Welte, Nachmos. im Pent. p. 178 f. has proved, especially to explain the usage of עֵבֶר, for the country on this and on that side in one and the same place, for instance, Num. xxxii. 19. Though it does not follow from this, that עֵבֶר signifies side or bank, but beside the objective geographical use of the word an ideal usage is also found, by virtue of which a writer independent of the place, where he really is, assumes in idea a stand-point, from which the two opposite sides may be designated as *on that side*, as Drechsler has satisfactorily proved, although all passages cannot be explained from this ideal stand-point, but in several the standing geographical usage undeniably prevails.

Judges, see Judg. xx. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 20; 2 Sam. iii. 10, xvii. 11, xxiv. 2, 15; 1 Chr. xxii. 2; 2 Chr. xxx. 5. Concerning Dan, comp. on xii. 29, and concerning Beersheba on xix. 2.

V. 6. "Solomon had 40,000 stalls for his chariot horses." אֻרְוֹת, or אֻרְיוֹת, signifies *(a)* mangers, comp. أَرِيّ, and ܐܘܪܝܐ, *praesepe*, from the root ארה, *carpere*; *(b) loculi in stabulis distincti*, (2 Chr. xxxii. 28), as Bochart (*hieroz. i. p.* 155), has proved.[1] Mangers for horses or horse-stands, that is, horses with separate stands or mangers, since, according to the testimony of *Vegetius* in Bochart, the present separation of mangers and stands for single horses was usual in ancient times.—The numeral ארבעים forty rests on an old error in transcription for ארבעה four (2 Chron. x. 25), as the older expositors have observed, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 338.—12,000 פָּרָשִׁים riding horses, comp. Ges.

[1] The meaning ascribed by Gesen. (*thes.* i. 146), to the word in the present passage, *jugum*, pair, team, is warranted neither by the etymology, nor the speech usage. The incorrectness of this meaning follows even from the number of אֻרְוֹת. For to 1400 chariots, which Solomon, according to chap. ix. 46 and 2 Chr. i. 14 had, 4000 horses suit very well, but not 4000 teams, as every war chariot, if they were similar to those of the Homeric heroes, as we may conclude from *Xenoph. Cyrop.* vi. 1—27, was drawn by two horses, beside which a third ran, in order to be yoked in, if one fell, comp. Jahn bibl. Archæol. ii. 2, p. 440, and Winer bibl., R.W., ii. p. 776 f. 1400 war-chariots with 4000 horses (as ought to be read instead of 40,000), also stand in due proportion to 12,000 riders, as well as to other biblical accounts of war-chariots. In Egypt, where the breeding of horses flourished from the earliest times, see on x. 28, Pharaoh in the times of Moses brought 600 (Ex. xiv. 7), and Shishak 1200 chariots into the field (2 Chr. xii. 3.) Zerah the Cushite has only 300 (2 Chr. xiv. 6), Sisera 900 (Judg. iv. 3 ff.), the Syrians of Mesopotamia 700 (2 Sam. x. 8), and Hadarezer 1000 chariots (1 Chr. xviii. 4.) All these accounts stand in due proportions and thereby prove themselves authentic, whereas the accounts of 30,000 chariots of the Philistines (1 Sam. xiii. 5), and 7000 in Chr. xix. 18, where in the parallel passage 2 Sam. x. 18 only 700 are named, are obviously corrupted. Some indeed, for ex. Winer in p. q., have found these numbers too great, and have cited against them the fact, that even the great army of Cyrus, with 120,000 cavalry, had only 2000 chariots (*Xenoph. exp. Cyr.* i. 7.) But it has been overlooked, that Cyrus introduced a new kind of chariot of great size, which carried twenty men, whereas the others could only carry one man besides the charioteer, comp. Jahn in p. q. p. 441 f.

*thes. s.v.* These chariot and saddle horses Solomon kept partly in Jerusalem, partly in several towns (x. 26; 2 Chr. i. 14, ix. 25), which he pitched upon for this purpose (ix. 19.)

V. 7. Comp. iv. 7.—V. 8. "Barley and straw for the horses and runners." On רֶכֶשׁ runner comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1289.—Barley which was very largely cultivated in Palestine (Lev. xxvii. 16; Deut. viii. 8; 2 Chr. ii. 10, &c.) was and is still in the East, where oats is not grown, a usual fodder for cattle, to which chopped straw mixed with barley, beans, and pounded date-kernels, is given, comp. Winer bibl., R.W., i. p. 481. Barley was baked only for the poorer classes, Jud. vii. 13; 2 Ki. iv. 12. *Panem ex hordeo antiquis usitatum vita damnavit quadrupedumque fere cibus est. Plin. h. n.* xviii. 7 (*Vol.* iii. *p.* 217 *ed. Sill.*) אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה שָׁם LXX. *οὗ ἂν ᾖ ὁ βασιλεύς*, as also the Vulgate and several others. רֶכֶשׁ is more correctly assumed, as the subject and the words are referred with Bochart and others to this, that the horses were distributed in different cities, x. 26.

V. 9—14. Solomon's wisdom. V. 9. רֹחַב לֵב *amplitudo animi de amplitudine ingenii et sapientiæ* (*Wineri lex.*), enlarged capacities. Under heart (לֵב) the Hebrews often comprise the capacities of the soul, comp. x. 24; Job ix. 4, xii. 3, xxxiv. 10; Prov. viii. 5, &c.—"As the sand on the sea shore,"—a proverbial description of extraordinary multitude and fulness,[1] comp. iv. 20; Gen. xli. 49; Jos. xi. 4; Judg. vii. 12; 1 Sam. xiii. 5; 2 Sam. xvii. 11; Hab. i. 9.—V. 10. The בְּנֵי קֶדֶם, whose wisdom Solomon excelled, are the Arabian tribes dwelling east of the Israelites, comp. Judg. vi. 3—33, vii. 12, viii. 10; Job i. 3; Is. xi. 14; Jer. xlix. 28; Ezek. xxv. 4 (*cf. Rosenm. Schol. ad h. l.*), where throughout בני קדם denote Arabian tribes, that spread themselves as far as the Euphrates. The wilderness of Arabia as far as the Euphrates is accordingly

[1] Too far sought is the explanation of our verse by Tholuck Uebers. u. Ausl. der Psalm p. xxiii, that Solomon embraced the boundaries of all that was worth knowing, as the ocean embraces the shores of all the earth. According to *A. Schultens, Prov. Sal. p.* 435, רחב לב denotes among the Arabs *tum scientiam vastissimam, tam vaste diffusam quam vastum mare aliquod, tum animos ad ardua quædam paratissimos iisque exantlandis capaces, etc.*

called ארץ קדם, Gen. xxv. 6. On the contrary אֶרֶץ בְּנֵי קֶדֶם, Gen. xxix. 1, denotes the country of those beyond the Euphrates (see Tuch on the passage) and הררי קדם, Num. xxiii. 7, the mountains of Mesopotamia (see Hengstenb. d. Gesh. Bib. p. 81.) In the present passage, however, by the sons of the East cannot with Clericus be understood the Chaldeans, neither themselves alone, nor with the Arabs, but only the latter alone. For although the wisdom of the Chaldeans, especially their astronomy and astrology, was celebrated in antiquity (comp. *Th. Stanlei. histor. philos. orient. ed. Clericus lib.* i., Winer, bibl., R.W., i., p. 259, and the expositors on Dan. ii. 2), yet it is not known, that proverbial wisdom, in which Solomon distinguished himself, flourished among them. The fatherland of proverbial wisdom is Arabia, see on chap. x. The wisdom, however, in which Solomon excelled the Egyptians, refers probably to his knowledge of plants and animals (v. 13.) For although the much praised, almost proverbial wisdom of the Egyptians (comp. Is. xix. 11, xxxi. 2; Acts vii. 22; Herodot. ii. 160; Joseph. Antiquit. viii. 2—5), extended also to several other branches of knowledge, as geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and astrology, &c., comp. Diod. Sic. i. 73—81; Marsham, *Can. Chron. p.* 142 *sq.*; and G. Seyffarth, Beitr. zur Kentniss Æg., part 2 *introd.* § 1, yet natural philosophy obtains a very important place in Egyptian wisdom, as may be inferred from the facts, that they were not only very skilful in the preparation of salves from vegetable and animal substance, but also had cultivated medical science so extensively, that according to Herod. ii. 84 the country was full of physicians, and there was a distinct physician for every separate disease, comp. Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 146 and 68.

V. 11. "Solomon excelled all men (of his time) in wisdom, even the celebrated singers Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, and Darda." Ethan the Ezrahite, of the Levitical family of Merari (1 Chr. vi. 29 ff.), composer of Ps. lxxxix., was president of the music in the tabernacle under David, 1 Chr. xv. 17—19. Heman, also an Ezrahite and composer of Ps. lxxxviii., according to 1 Chr. xv. 17, a son of Joel, was among the most celebrated singers of David in the tabernacle, and at the same time חֹזֶה of the king, 1 Chr. xv. 19, xvi. 41, xxv. 1—4. Chalcol and Darda, the sons of

Machol, are mentioned nowhere else.[1] בְּנֵי מָחוֹל some consider an appellative; as Luther, "the poets," but incorrectly; etymologically more correct *Hiller* in the *Onom.* gives *sacras choreas ducendi periti*, sons of the dance, as "daughters of song" in Eccl. xii. 4. But מָחוֹל is here obviously a *nom. propr.* וַיְהִי שְׁמוֹ וגו׳, that is, he was celebrated among all the heathen nations around, comp. x. 1, 23 f., and is still to this day in the East.[2]

V. 12. "And he spake 3000 proverbs." מָשָׁל, according to its etymology, comparison, likeness, see Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bib. p. 78, denotes sentences, gnomes or short witty sayings, in which a truth is represented in a lively manner by the pregnant comparison of two objects, Prov. i. 1—6, x. 1 &c. Thence flows the derived meaning, proverb, 1 Sam. x. 12, &c.[3] Of these proverbs of Solomon we still possess a considerable portion in the Book of Proverbs. For even if the whole collection found in the

[1] After Grotius and Clericus, the four Levites here named have been identified by Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 237, with Ethan, Heman, Calcol, and Dara, descendants of Zerah, son of Judah, mentioned 1 Chr. ii. 6. Quite arbitrarily, as nothing is more frequent than like names in different tribes and families, comp. my apolog. Versuch. üb. d. Chron. p. 164 f.

[2] Josephus has considerably embellished the biblical accounts of the wisdom of Solomon. He mentions conjuring books which Solomon composed, and by means of which, in his time, demons were cast out (*Antiq.* viii. 2, 5.) Comp. *Origines ad Matth.* xxvi. 63. Nicet. *Chron. annal.* 4, 7. Other writings also of Solomon are adduced by *Suidas s.v.* Ἐζεκίας, by *Mich. Glyk. Annal.* 2, *p.* 183, and Eusebius *præp. evang.* ix. 31, and others. See *Fabricii cod. pseudepigr.* i. 914 *sqq.*, 1014 *sq.* According to the Koran Solomon understood the languages not only of men and demons, but also of birds and ants, with all of whom he held intercourse (Sur. 27, v. 17 ff.) The Turkish literature is able to show a book of Solomon, Suleimanname, consisting of seventy volumes, from which v. Hammer (Rosenöl i. p. 147 ff.) has made extracts.

[3] "The wisdom" (of the Hebrews), says Umbreit, Intr. to his Comment. on the Prob. of Sol. p. lii. f., "teaches in short proverbs, now with figurative illustration, now with impressive brevity, by enigmatical sayings also leading the understanding to the quick observation of moral truth, quite in the usual manner of the East," &c. In a much more definite, vigorous, and comprehensive manner, Ewald in p. q. characterises the matter and form of the proverbial wisdom of the Hebrews founded by Solomon.

canon does not belong to Solomon, yet according to Ewald's profound investigation in the introduction to his translation of the Proverbs of Solomon, p. 26 ff., there lies at the ground of the oldest part of it a collection composed by Solomon himself, which, however, embracing 3000 proverbs, was much larger than the book handed down to us in the canon, that contains only 915 verses and still fewer proverbs, as the first chapters contain an introduction to the proper proverbs, and from chapter xxv. follows a later collection with two appendices.—" And his songs were 1005." Of these we possess only Ps. lxxii. and cxxvii., to the composition of which by Solomon no fundamental objection can be made, and certainly also Ps. cxxxii. Perhaps, also, the Song of Songs is to be reckoned under this head.

V. 13. " And he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall," that is, of all plants from the greatest to the least. The cedars of Lebanon are known as the finest and greatest of trees, comp. Winer, bibl. R.W. i. 250 ff., and Rosenm. bibl. Althk. iv. 1, p. 238 ff.—אֵזוֹב, hyssop, is not the plant known in Germany under this name, but the organy or wild marjoram, in Greek ὀρίγανον, by the Arabs called صَعْتَر, or زَعْتَر, an aromatic plant that loves a very stony soil, so that it often grows out of rubbish heaps and old walls; comp. Faber in Keil's and Tzschirner's Analekt. i. p. 3 ff., and Rosenm. in p. q. p. 108 ff.—" And he spake of four-footed beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." Under these four designations are included the whole animal kingdom, comp. Gen. vi. 20, vii. 8. וַיְדַבֵּר seems to presume scientific investigations. But whether Solomon composed treatises on botany and zoology, as some commentators suppose, cannot be shown at least from this verse. Neither is anything said of the written composition of his proverbs and songs, although this is probable.[1]

V. 14. The great fame of Solomon's wisdom, the more rare

[1] Josephus in his traditionary description (*Antiq.* viii. 2, 5) makes him compose 1005 βιβλία περὶ ᾠδῶν καὶ μελῶν and 3000 βίβλους παραβολῶν καὶ εἰκόνων, but of plants and animals only παραβολὴν εἶπεν.

such a thing was in those times, led so much the greater number of strangers to Jerusalem from all kingdoms to which his fame had spread; among others a queen of Sheba, whose arrival in Jerusalem is related in ch. x. This chapter is therefore to be regarded as the continuation of this section; all that intervenes relates to the great buildings, especially the temple, by which Solomon rendered his name most illustrious.

### VV. 15—32. PREPARATIONS FOR THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.

V. 15 ff. Solomon negotiates with Hiram King of Tyre for the building materials and workmen required for the temple. 2 Chr. ii. furnishes a parallel passage completing this section. Comp. concerning the mutual relation of the two accounts my apol. Vers. p. 216—221.

V. 15. Hiram (חִירָם or חִירוֹם, v. 24, and חוּרָם, 1 Chr. xv. 1; 2 Chr. ii. 2, 11, &c.) King of Tyre and Sidon (v. 20) congratulates Solomon through an embassy on his accession to the throne, and thereby renews the friendship which he had always cherished towards David with his son and successor.[1]—V. 16—20.

[1] Josephus reports (*Antiq.* viii. 3, 1, and *c. Ap.* i. 18) from Menander of Ephesus, that the building of Solomon's temple commenced in the 12th year of Hiram's reign, and Hiram died, after a reign of 34 years, in the 53d year of his life. It accords with this, that, according to 1 Ki. ix. 10—14; 2 Chr. viii. 1, Hiram was still reigning after the completion of Solomon's buildings, which continued 20 years (vi. 38, vii. 1); for Hiram had become king perhaps eight years before Solomon, or in the 33d year of the reign of David. But the same Hiram, 2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Chr. xiv. 1, sent David cedars for the building of his palace. Now, if it is also probable that the brief notice concerning this building (2 Sam. v. and 1 Chr. xiv.) is not related in strictly chronological order, but according to a certain natural order is appended immediately to the narrative of the conquest of the fortress of Zion, which David selected for a residence,—as also the section 2 Sam. vii. is annexed only according to a natural, not a chronological connection, to the account of the bringing up of the ark to Zion, since David first conceived the plan of the building of the temple after God had given him rest from all his foes round about,—and if also it can by no means be certainly concluded with the older expositors from 2 Sam. xi. 2,

After Hiram had thus commenced friendship with Solomon, the latter treats with him by an embassy about cedars and cypresses (v. 22) from Lebanon, and also about workmen to hew them, in which his people would assist the Tyrians.—V. 17. Solomon presumes that Hiram is aware of David's plan to build a temple: David must thus have been long employed about this object, and have already negotiated with Hiram about it, of which there is nothing in 2 Sam., whereas, according to 1 Chr. xxii. 4, the Sidonians and Tyrians had already brought David cedars in abundance for the intended building of the temple. Only the building itself David was not allowed to execute "מִפְּנֵי הַמִּלְחָמָה וגו׳ *propter bellum, quo eum circumdederant sc. hostes (J. H. Mich.)*, until Jehovah put them (the foes) under the soles of his feet." These words are not to be so understood as if David, only on account of his continual wars, had not time or leisure for the building of the temple; for, according to 2 Sam. vii. 1, this hindrance was already removed, when he formed the design of building it; but have the meaning: "because David was involved in too many wars, had shed too much blood" (comp. on this hindrance *Cleric. ad* 1 Chron. xxii. 8), as he himself de-

that David's palace of cedars was at that time already built, yet it remains quite improbable that David had undertaken the building of this palace only in the last seven years of his reign, that is, in the 63d year of his life. To obviate this difficulty, Clericus, on 2 Sam. v. 11, and Buddeus, suppose two successive Hirams, father and son, as kings of Tyre, of whom the former was connected with David, the latter with Solomon,—against the testimony of Menander of Ephesus, that Hiram's predecessor was Abibal—but des Vignoles in the *Chronol. de l'hist. S.* ii. *p.* 59 *sqq.*, having this testimony in view, endeavours with great expenditure of sagacity and learning to establish the assumption, that the Hiram, who was the friend of David, was the grandfather of the confederate of Solomon and son of Abibal. But both hypotheses want a secure basis, and are proved untenable at once by the words: "for Hiram was a lover of David all his days" (כָּל־הַיָּמִים), 2 Sam. v. 11, but still more by that, which Solomon, 2 Chr. ii. 2, writes to Hiram: "as thou didst deal with David my father, and didst send him cedars to build him an house to dwell in." There remains only the alternative, either to place the building of David's palace in the end of his reign, or, as this is very improbable, to assume an error in the account transmitted by Josephus of the year of Hiram's reign, for which I have decided in my treatise, der Tempel Salomo's p. 24. Not.

clared as well in the last assembly of estates, 1 Chr. xxviii. 3, as also previously to his son Solomon on delivering the materials collected for the building of the temple (1 Chr. xxii. 8.)[1]

V. 18. Comp. 2 Sam. vii. 1. The peace from all enemies, which David only attained towards the end of his reign, Solomon enjoyed from the beginning of his sovereignty. פֶּגַע רָע an evil occurrence, several of which befel David, for instance, the rebellion of his son, the plague on account of numbering the people and the like. V. 19. אָמַר with infinitive following, to purpose to do something, Ex. ii. 12; 2 Sam. xxi. 16; comp. *Ges. thes.* i. 120. His purpose to build the temple Solomon founds upon the word of promise, 2 Sam. vii. 12 f. David also understands this promise made to himself in the same manner, 1 Chr. xxii. 9 f., xxviii. 6, without recognizing the deeper Messianic sense relating to a more distant future. The phrase, "to build an house unto the name of the Lord," is founded upon Deut. xii. 5, "the place which the Lord shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there," which in v. 11 is thus paraphrased, "to cause his name to dwell there." The name of God is "the manifestation and presence of God in his church," comp. Nitzsch System, p. 126, ed. 4, and Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 270 ff.—According to v. 20, Solomon entreats only for cedars, but from the answer of Hiram, v. 22, it appears that he requested also cypresses, 2 Chr. ii. 7. We have the transaction only in an incomplete extract. This appears from comparison with the parallel 2 Chr. ii. according to which Solomon first applies for a skilful artisan, of which the narrative is here silent, and afterwards (vii. 13 f.), only mentions, by the way, that Hiram sent him.—Concerning the cedars of Lebanon, comp. beside the authorities already cited at v. 13, Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 167 ff., *Gesen. thes.* i. 148, but especially v. Raumer, Pal. p. 31 f., and Robins. Pal. iii. The cedar forest, celebrated from ancient times, lies at least two days' journey north of Beirut, near the northernmost and highest peak of the mountain, from six to eight hours north of Jebel Sunnin, (Rob. iii. p. 723), not far east of the con-

[1] Thus rightly understoood, this verse confirms the statements of Chronicles that are rejected as unworthy of credit by a superficial criticism.

vent Kanobin, the seat of the Patriarch of the Maronites, by the village of Bsherreh. Moreover, Seetzen in 1805 discovered two other groves of greater extent, and the American missionaries in their travels through the mountain have met with cedars in other quarters still. Besides, Prof. Ehrenberg has found cedars in great abundance in the part of the mountain lying north of the way between Baalbek and Tripolis, (Rob. iii. p. 724.) Lebanon is described by Winer, bibl. R. W. ii. p. 27 f. and v. Raumer, Pal. p. 29 ff. He derives its name, "the white mountain," not, as is often asserted, from the eternal snow, with which its highest summits are covered; for this is not in sufficient quantity to lend a constantly marked appearance to the mountain; but from the white limestone, which gives to the rocky surface, as it reflects the light, a white appearance in all directions, (Rob. iii. p. 724.) —"For no one among us understands how to hew timber as the Sidonians," who therefore were under the sceptre of Hiram. For even if, according to the correct remark of Gesenius, the Sidonians stand here for the Phenicians in general, yet Solomon could not express himself in this manner to Hiram, unless the Sidonians belonged to his dominions. The inhabitants of Sidon, for the site and history of which read Robins. iii. p. 696 ff., were celebrated from ancient times as skilful builders, and very expert in mechanical arts. Sidon had glass works, linen and other manufactures, that furnished very ingenious and far-sought commodities. Strabo ascribes to them great knowledge in philosophy, astronomy, geometry, arithmetic, navigation, and all the fine arts, comp. Pal. iii. p. 700, not. and Winer, bibl. R. W. ii. p. 534.

V. 21. Hiram praises Jehovah, the God of Israel. It cannot be inferred from this alone that he acknowledged and revered the only true God. According to polytheistic ideas, he might concede to the God of Israel the same reality as to his own gods. A greater recognition of Jehovah he expresses, 2 Chr. ii. 11, where he characterises him as the Creator of heaven and earth. Still even this by no means involves the full and true recognition of the Lord, but may be explained from an assent of Hiram to the religious views of the Israelites, that could not remain un known to him in his long friendship with David.

V. 22 ff. Hereupon Hiram sends to Solomon, and promises

him by letter (2 Chr. ii. 10) the fulfilment of all his wishes. בַּעֲצֵי אֲרָזִים, in timber of cedars, that is, in respect to the same. בְּרוֹשׁ denotes not the fir, but the cypress, and indeed according to Faber's (Archæol. i. p. 370 ff.) probable conjecture as well the evergreen. (*cupr. sempervirens*), as the dwarf cypress, (*cup. thyoides*), and the savin tree (*juniperus Sabina*), comp. *Ges. thes.* i. 246.—V. 23. אֲשִׂימֵם וגו׳, literally, I will make them into floats on the sea, that is, bind the trees in floats and cause them to float on the sea to the place which thou appointest to me. שָׁלַח *c. acc. r. et* אֶל *pers.*, to commit anything to any one. This meaning developes itself from the phrase, to send words to any one, Ch. xx. 9, xxi. 11, and with double *Accus. rei* and אֶל *pers.*, to send one with words to any one, that is, to charge him therewith, Jer. xlii. 5, 21, xliii. 1. In none of these passages does שָׁלַח mean simply *indicare*, as Gesen. in his *lex. man. s.v.* states. —וְנִפַּצְתִּים, and will there take them (the floats) asunder, and thou wilt send for (them thence.) לֶחֶם בֵּיתִי, provisions for my house (court.) According to v. 25, Solomon gave Hiram yearly 20,000 cors of wheat and 20 cors of the finest oil. The land of Israel was rich in corn and oil, Phœnicia, on the contrary, poor. Besides, he gave the Phœnician labourers on Lebanon a large quantity of wheat, barley, wine, and oil, for their sustenance, 2 Chr. ii. 9, 14, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 219. On מַכֹּלֶת for מַאֲכֹלֶת, Isa. ix. 4, 18, see Ew. Gram. § 93.—שֶׁמֶן כָּתִית, beaten, that is, finest oil, that was obtained from olives not fully ripe, and pounded in mortars, had a whiter colour, as well as a better flavour, and yielded a purer and clearer light than the ordinary olive oil obtained through the press, comp. *Celsii hierob.* ii. p. 349 f. and Bähr, Symbol. Mos. Cult. i. p. 419.[1]

[1] That the common oil is not here spoken of, but the finest quality of it, has been overlooked by those critics, who, as *Jac. Capellus, obs. in. h. l.*, and Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 165, would read 20,000 instead of 20 cors. Still more arbitrarily J. D. Mich. and Dereser proceed, who wish to complete the numbers in this passage from 2 Chr. ii. 9. 20,000 cors of the finest oil can in no case be intended, as even in Chron. only 20,000 baths, that is, 2000 cors are mentioned. But if we consider, that the oil, which Solomon furnished for the court of Hiram from year to year, was not the ordinary but the finest kind, of

V. 26. The here repeated remark, "the Lord gave Solomon wisdom," iii. 12, is intended to indicate to the reader the true point of view for that which precedes and follows. Solomon displayed the wisdom granted to him of the Lord as well in the treaty formed with Hiram, whereby he obtained materials and skilled workmen for the splendid buildings erected to the honour of his reign, as also in the application of the labours of his subjects which were still requisite and at his command for this object.

V. 27. וַיַּעַל וגו' he levied socage labourers out of all Israel. ויעל literally, he caused to go up out of the people, that is, he levied, not *in tabulas retulit* (*Ges.*) On מַס comp. on iv. 6.— מִכָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל out of all the people of Israel. Erroneously Studer on Judg. i. 28, from the land of Israel, from the whole compass of which Solomon had driven the scattered descendants of the Canaanites to his great architectural works. For these 30,000 men are different from the remnant of the Canaanites who were reduced to slavery, who are mentioned in vv. 29, 30, and Ch. ix. 20 f. These are called מַס עֹבֵד ix. 21, as Jos. xvi. 10. And if elsewhere the simple מַס denotes such Canaanitish bondservants, for example, Jos. xvii. 13; Judg. i. 28—30; 2 Chr. viii. 8, yet the author expressly distinguishes מַס from מַס עֹבֵד, when he adds, after mentioning the latter, ix. 22, "but of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bondmen" (עֶבֶד). These 30,000 socagers taken from the Israelites are also distinguished from the bondslaves from among the surviving Canaanites by this, that only 10,000 of them in turn labour one month at Lebanon, and spend the following two months at home, evidently to attend to their farms and houses, whereas the Canaanitish bondslaves had to labour there the whole year, v. 28.

V. 29 f. The 70,000 bearers of burdens, and 80,000 hewers of wood and stone, here mentioned, are, according to ix. 20, and 2 Chr. ii. 16 f., viii. 7—9, bondslaves taken from the unextirpated remnant of the Canaanitish tribes. With regard to the

which on account of the difficulty of preparation scarcely so much could be procured as of the ordinary quality, the quantity of 20 cors, that is, 200 baths mentioned in the text will not appear too small, especially as the cor was a very large measure (comp. on v. 2.)

number of the officers superintending the workmen there is a singular difference between our narrative and that in Chron. According to 2 Chr. ii. 17, Solomon set over the bondslaves 3600 overseers out of the remaining Canaanites, to set the people to work. Besides these he had, according to 2 Chr. viii. 10, 250 שָׂרֵי הַנִּצָּבִים captains of officers over his buildings. According to our passage, on the contrary, 3300 שׂרי הנצ׳ are over the 150,000 Canaanitish bondslaves, and, according to Chr. ix. 23, 550 captains of officers besides over the socagers. As according to this the sum total of the officers, 3850 agrees in both narratives, we must not proceed with Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 61, to explain the deviations from the errors or changes of the numeral characters in copying them into numeral words, but, as I have already remarked in my apol. Vers. p. 221, attempt another arrangement. J. H. Michaelis (*adn. ad. h. l.*) explains the difference by a different principle of division. In Chron. the foreign and the Israelitish officers were distinguished, 3600 foreigners, and 250 Israelites: in Kings, on the contrary, the *inferiores et superiores praefecti*. Solomon may have had 3300 inferior overseers, and 550 superior, of whom 250 were selected from the Israelites, and 300 from the Canaanites. It appears to be against this arrangement that in Kings as well the 3300 as the 550 are designated as שָׂרֵי הַנִּצָּבִים הָרֹדִים בָּעָם; though it is correct in the main point. For if we consider 2 Chr. viii. 1—10 attentively, it appears, that the overseers mentioned, v. 10, had the supreme oversight of the labourers in Solomon's buildings in the country, but the 3600 mentioned, 2 Chr. ii. 17, were appointed out of the Canaanitish aliens over the labourers on Lebanon. If we compare with this the narrative, 1 Ki. ix. 15—23, we perceive that the socagers in all the buildings of Solomon are here spoken of. Now, when the number of the overseers is stated in v. 23 at 550, and thus at 300 more than in the parallel passage of Chronicles, there can scarcely be a doubt but that in the number 550 the 300 Canaanitish overseers omitted in our chapter are included with the 250 superior overseers, and the reason why these 300 are not mentioned sooner, but here for the first time, can only lie in this, that they did not fall into the same category with the 3300, but had the supreme oversight

of the labourers at Lebanon, as the 250 had that in the remaining buildings.[1] V. 31. Comp. vii. 9, 10.

In v. 32 the result of Solomon's negotiations with Hiram is given, and this section thereby closed. פסל to hew, as well stone as wood. וְהַגִּבְלִים and the Giblim, that is, inhabitants of גְּבַל جُبَيْل, جِبْلة Byblos, north of Berytus on an eminence by the Mediterranean, (comp. *Ges. thes.* i. 250, and Winer's bibl. R. W. i. p. 240) and lying nearest the celebrated cedar forest of all the great Phœnician cities. According to Ezek. xxvii. 9, the Byblians were also distinguished for shipbuilding.—By the position of this verse is decided also the question, whether the גבלים belonged to the בְּנֵי חִירָם, of which J. D. Mich. was doubtful. As the result of the section is here collected, the Giblim must have been given to Solomon by Hiram for labour, and have been subject to him as well as the Sidonians (v. 20), and therefore are identical with the בְּנֵי חִירָם, as Cler. on Jos. xiii. 5; and Gesen. on Is. i. p. 725 have rightly observed. Hence it follows at the same time, that the Phœnician labourers in these buildings were in comparison with Solomon's own subjects a small number, and that they constituted merely the master workmen, under whose superintendence Solomon's people executed the works.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.[2]

This chapter falls into two sections. *a.* The building of the temple, its size, internal and external plan, and the materials employed, are described vv. 1—10, to which is immediately

[1] Unsatisfactory are the attempts of *Ludov. Capellus* in the *descriptio templi Hierosol. juxta mentem Villalpandi* in the London Polyglott, vol. i., p. 20; of Lundius, jüd. Heiligth. Bd. 2. ch. 3. § 23; of *H. B. Stark, not. sel. in Vet. Test. p.* 153; and of others.

[2] As, in my treatise, der tempel Salomo's, Dorpat, 1839, I have

appended, vv. 11—13, the promise made to Solomon during the progress of the building, and the first section is closed with verse 14. Then follows, *b.* the larger account of the internal finish and ornature of the structure, vv. 15—36. Thus the proper building is completed, and the chapter closes appropriately with an account of the length of time it was in building. The brazen pillars erected before the temple porch, as well as the furniture of the temple, though important in reference to the sanctuary, yet did not belong to the building itself, but only to the fitting up of the edifice for worship. In chap. vii., therefore, the description of the royal palace built after the temple follows next, vv. 1—12, and only then the account of the pillars and temple furniture executed in metal by the Tyrian artist Hiram.[2]

enumerated the older works on this subject, and with constant reference to them have given the most intelligible representation possible of the whole temple in all its parts, and also have developed the symbolic import of the whole building, I shall confine myself here to the exegetical illustration of the several verses, and for the rest refer constantly to this treatise for the sake of brevity merely in the words, "s. i. p. q." Since that time only two short descriptions of Solomon's temple, by Fr. Kugler, Hdb. der Kunstgesch. p. 78 ff. and C. Schnaase, Gesch. d. bildenden künste bei den Alt. Düsseldorf 1843, vol. i., p. 239 ff. 264 ff., have come into my hands, by which, however, the investigation has been in no degree advanced.

[2] A parallel to both chapters is furnished in 2 Chr. iii. and iv., where, however, the arrangement of the matter is different. In Chronicles the external building of the temple is not, as in our narrative, separated from its internal decoration and arrangement, but after the size of the temple to be built has been mentioned, ch. iii. 3, follows the description *a.* of the porch, vii. 4; *b.* of the temple itself, and *α* of the holy place with its inner decoration, vv. 5—7, *β* of the holiest in its size and decoration, with the colossal cherubim erected in it and the vail before it, which is entirely omitted in Kings, vv. 8—14; *c.* the brazen pillars before the porch, vv. 15—17; *d.* the altar of burnt-offering, ch. iv. 1, which is not mentioned in Kings; *e.* the brazen sea, vv. 2—5; *f.* the brazen lavers, golden candlesticks, tables of shew-bread and golden basons, vv. 6—8; *g.* the courts, v. 9, whereupon the account concludes with a summary compend of the different temple furniture, vv. 10—22, which agrees almost verbally with 1 Ki. vii. 39—50. This so clearly observable difference of plan strengthens greatly the proof derived in my apolog. Vers. p. 328 from the different omissions and additions of the collateral narrative, that the two descriptions are incomplete extracts, made independently of one another from a common source, and not, as Movers Krit. Unters. p. 59 ff. has, after a superficial comparison of the two accounts, asserted, that the writer of Chronicles has employed the Books of Kings as an original source.

V. 1. The building of the temple forms a great epoch in the history of the theocracy. With it not only does the Mosaic worship gain an important accession in solidity and splendour, and the people itself a fixed central sanctuary, inasmuch as the Lord sanctions the temple on its consecration in the most solemn manner as the place chosen by him for his name; but also with it an end is first made to the provisional state of Israel in the promised land, and the Divine assurance, that he will "appoint a place for his people Israel, that they might dwell in a place of their own and move no more, neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime" (2 Sam. vii. 10), completely fulfilled. The importance of this epoch is indicated by this, that the time of building is determined not only by the year of Solomon's reign, but also by the departure from Egypt. 430 years was Israel in Egypt (Ex. xii. 40); 480 years elapsed from the departure out of this land of bondage to the foundation of the temple. These two numbers form two fixed resting points for the chronology of the history of Israel in ancient times, for which the historical books of the Old Testament contain no uninterrupted era, while there is no solid ground either for shortening the 430 years' residence of Israel in Egypt with some critics after the example of the LXX. to 215 years, or for lengthening the period of 480 years from the departure out of Egypt to the building of the temple according to an arbitrary combination of Josephus, with J. D. Mich., Jahn, and others, to 592 years.[1]

V. 2. The walls of the temple were measured from within,

[1] As the proof of the correctness of the 430 years' residence of Israel in Egypt is not in place here, it may be merely remarked by the way, that the statement of Ex. xii. 40, in itself as definite as clear, derives no small confirmation from Ezek. iv. 5, 6, where the 390 and 40 = 430 days to be reckoned as years, are obviously taken from the duration of the Egyptian bondage, comp. Hävern. Comm. on the passage. —The correctness of the 480 years in our passage, which I have formerly shown in the "chronological investigation of the years, which elapsed from the departure of Israel from Egypt to the building of Solomon's temple," in the "Dorptischen Beitr. zu d. theol. Wissensch." ii. p. 303 ff., cannot be placed in doubt by the recent essay of *Archinard, la chronol. sacreé, baseé sur les decouvertes de Champollion, Par.* 1841. p. 59 ff. to fix this period at 498 years, as this essay is wholly based on the synchronism of the old Egyptian history, a foundation at present far too uncertain.

sixty cubits long, twenty broad, and thirty high; s. i. p. q. p. 49 ff. The cubit is the Mosaic, after the earlier standard, 2 Chr. iii. 3, or holy cubit, according to Ezek. xl. 5, xliii. 13, a hand-breadth longer than the common and later one, and according to the careful meteorological investigations of Böckh in Bertheau, z. Gesch. d. Isr. p. 61, equal to 234, 333 Paris lines. The Hebrew word אַמָּה springs from the Coptic *mahe* or *mahi*, with the prefix, *ammahi*, the forearm the cubit, see Berth. i. p. q. p. 51.

V. 3. The porch before the sanctuary was also built of square stones, s. i. p. q. p. 83 ff. "Twenty cubits the length thereof before the breadth of the house, ten cubits the breadth thereof before the house;" that is, it was as broad as the house, twenty cubits, while the greater dimension running parallel to the breadth of the house is called the length, and ten cubits deep. Its height is not given in our narrative, and cannot be ascertained with certainty, as the statement of 120 cubits, (2 Chr. iii. 4), rests manifestly on an old error in transcription, s. i. p. q. p. 90 ff.

V. 4. The windows in the temple, concerning the number, nature, and position of which great variety of opinion prevails, (s. in p. q. p. 60--64), were opened in the upper part of the walls above the side stories, which were from 18 to 20 cubits high, probably in the two side walls, in the back wall above the holiest, and, provided the porch was lower than the interior, perhaps also in the front over the porch.—חַלּוֹנֵי שְׁקֻפִים אֲטֻמִים is not to be explained with the Chald., Syr., Ephr. Syr., Theodor., Procop. of Gaza, several Rabbins, Luther, and others, by *fenestrae intus latae foris angustae*, but signifies windows with closed beams, that is, fixed, whose lattices or blinds cannot be opened or closed at pleasure, as the windows of ordinary dwellings, 2 Ki. xiii. 17; Dan. vi. 10. שְׁקֻפִים signifies nothing but beams, cross-pieces, vii. 4, s. i. p. q. p. 62 not.—אֲטֻמִים from אטם, to shut, closed, therefore fixed, as in Syr. and Arab., comp. besides, *Gesen. thes.* i. 77, especially Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 652. These windows serve partly to let out the vapour of the lamps and the smoke of the frankincense, partly to light as well the holy place, which, on account of its height of 30 cubits, being three times that of the tabernacle, was not sufficiently lighted by the lamps of the candlesticks, as also the chambers that were above the holy of holies.

Vv. 5, 6, The additional building on the three sides of the temple is called יָצוּעַ, for which the *Keri* has constantly יָצִיעַ. The word is not *gen. fœm.* or *term. techn.*, as Fürst, *Concord. s.v.*, thinks, but *gen. comm.*, but so that the *masc.* has a collective meaning, the whole wing consisting of three stories (vv. 5, 10), the *fœm.* on the other hand denotes the single story of this wing. This in Hebrew rare, but in Arabic frequent distinction of the collective and the individual by the *gen. masc.* and *fœm.* is usually expressed by a separate feminine ending, as אֳנִי, fleet, group of ships, and אֳנִיָּה, a single ship, comp. Ewald, Heb. Gram. § 368, and *gramm. crit. ling. Arab.* i. § 295.—יָצוּעַ, *stratum*, signifies, like the Latin, *contignatio*, the joistwork or beams, then the story consisting of joistwork, and collectively the building composed of such stories. אֶת־קִירוֹת, not *cum parietibus, i.e. contigue ad parietes* (Seb. Schm., J. H. Mich.), but את is *not. accus.*, and אֶת־קִירוֹת is a nearer definition of the עַל קִיר. The verse is to be rendered, "And he built against the wall of the house stories round about, namely, round about the walls of the house, against the holy place, and the most holy, and so made chambers round about." צְלָעוֹת signifies here, and in Ezek. xli. 6 ff., side chambers. This is settled, but the fundamental meaning is contested.[1] Gesenius in the *thes.* iii. 1171 gives the meanings of צֵלָע, 1. *costa*, 2. *latus, a costa proficiscitur lateris significatio*, 3. *conclave laterale* and holds *eminendi*,

[1] The ground-meaning, that which is to be torn off, separated, derived by Böttcher (Proben p. 340) from the supposed relation between צֵלָע and אָצַל, and to which v. Lengerke, Comm. on Dan. vii. 5, and Hofmann (Weissag. u. Erfüll. im A. u. N. T. i. p. 64) have assented, is erroneously determined. For אצל signifies neither, to tear asunder, nor, as Ges. *thes.* i. 143 states, *junxit, copulavit*, but simply *vergere, inclinare, reclinare, ad al., inniti alc. rei*, related to עצל *resupinum*, then *pigrum esse;* thence אֵצֶל *id quod fultum seu innixum est, latus rei*, and as adv. *apud, juxta.* See the other derivatives אָצִיל and אַצִּל in *Fürstii Concord.* p. 115. From אֵצֶל *latus* comes, as Gesen. *l.c.* has rightly observed, the *denom.* אָצַל *ad latus posuit, seposuit, etc.*, whereas Fürst *l.c.* constitutes this אָצַל, a separate root from the former. Were the fundamental meaning of אָצַל, to tear asunder, אֵצֶל must mean the contrary of *apud, juxta ;* it must signify, separated, divided from.

*prominendi significatum* to be the fundamental meaning. But it is impossible to see how *costa* arises from this as the first meaning. And the Arab. طلع has not the first meaning assigned to it by Gesenius, *prominuit, exseruit se (dens,)* but means—as may be learned from the various meanings enumerated in Freytag's *lex. Arab.* iii. p. 64—nothing more than go forth, appear, come to light, go up, mount. The fundamental signification of צֶלַע is much rather according to Fürst's *Concord.* p. 955. *Se inclinavit, acclinavit* thence derived, *claudicavit,* properly, to lean constantly to one side. In Arab. corresponds ضلع in the same sense, thence ضِلْع *costa,* ضِلْعة *latus.* In Hebrew from this primary meaning for צֵלָע the meanings, side, side-piece, side-wall, for example, of the ark, Ex. xxv. 12—14, &c., of the dwelling, Ex. xxvi. 20—35, &c., of the altar, Ex. xxvii. 7, xxx. 4, &c., side-boards of the dwelling, boards which formed the side-walls of the dwelling, Ex. xxvi. 26, 27, side of a mountain, slope, 2 Sam. xvi. 13, side in the human body, Gen. ii. 21 f.;[1] then צְלָעִים the sides, leaves of a door, 1 Ki. vi. 34, and, used of buildings, side-parts, side-stories, side-chambers, that are attached to the main buildings, so here and Ezek. xli. 6 ff. From the meaning, side or side-piece, is developed the idea of a piece presenting an extended flat surface, a broad board, vi. 15, 16. The meaning laid down by Gesen. and Fürst *trabs, asser* does not properly belong to the word, comp. farther vii. 3.

[1] In Gen. ii. 21 f. צֵלָע indeed is usually rendered rib. But this meaning is not clearly ascertained, although not so decidedly erroneous, as Hofmann i. p. q. asserts. In the obscurity of the matter this passage can no more be employed for ascertaining the proper meaning of the word than Dan. vii. 5, because the meaning of עלע is disputed, see Häverm. on the passage, and עלע is elsewhere found only in the *Targ. Hierosol.* Gen. xliv. 9, in the phrase, manifestly alluding to Gen. ii. 21 f., אלולי דהוה עלע מן בית אבא, where rib does not suit. And Job xviii. 12, Ps. xxxviii. 18, and Jer. xx. 10, can contribute nothing to a decision, because here it is a question, whether צַלְעִי is to be derived from צֵלָע *latus* or צֶלַע *claudicatio,* although in Job xviii. 12 Hirzel's explanation, it is ready for my fall, that is, to cause me to fall, remains in the highest degree doubtful.

V. 6. The breadth of these side stories was different; the lowest in the interior five, the middle six, and the highest seven cubits broad, because a reduction in the very thick wall of the temple (s. i. p. q. p. 53 f.) took place at every story, that is, a rebate was made, on which the beams of the side floor rested, without penetrating the temple wall. Hence this wing should appear as a building partly supported by the temple, resting on the ledges of its wall, but still not intermingled with it, and in this way the high dignity of the sanctuary be preserved, s. i. p. q. p. 52 f., 55 f. The height of these side chambers was, according to v. 8, 5 cubits; concerning their probable length and number, s. i. p. q. p. 56. Concerning the peculiar use of בָּ in measurements—5, 6, 7 in the cubit = 5, 6, 7 cubits, which is also found in the Aethiopic, comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 696, Not., and *thes.* i. 110.

Ver. 7. אֶבֶן שְׁלֵמָה מַסָּע,[1] "all unviolated stones of the quarry," that is, not altogether unhewn stones, that Providence had caused so to grow that they did not need to be wrought (Theod. and Procop.), but stones that were so hewn and wrought immediately in the quarry, that in the building of the temple walls neither hammer nor chisel, nor any tool of iron was required to prepare them farther—*lapides integri excisionis, i.e. quales excisi erant. Win. lex.* The expression, "hammer, chisel —was not heard," is by no means hyperbolical (Deres.), and is intended not only to attest the skill of the Tyrian builders, but serves merely for the nearer definition of the א׳ שׁ׳ מ׳. In ordinary buildings the stones were only hewn to sit where the walls were erected, but it was otherwise in the building of the temple; in this case they were completely dressed at the quarry.

In v. 8 the brevity of the expression has been the cause of much misunderstanding. The correct interpretation I have already (i. p. q. p. 58 ff.) given: "A door into the middle chamber (of the under story) was in the right side of the house, and they went up with winding stairs into the middle (chamber of the middle story) and from the middle into the third story." In

[1] Concerning the grammatical connexion of these words, in which even Maurer stumbled, conceiving מסע to be not the genitive, but in apposition to אבן, comp. Gesen. Gramm. § 113, 1.

ordinary houses they could ascend by a stair from without to the upper chamber (עֲלִיָּה) without interfering with the middle story, comp. Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 548. Here they went first through a door from without, not from the interior of the sanctuary—as Schnaase, i. p. q. asserts—into the middle chamber of the under story, and from this chamber the winding stair led to the middle and upper story. The stair was erected in the chamber itself, not in the temple wall (Theod., Proc., and others), where it would not only have had no room above, but would have violated the sanctuary more than the holes for the joists which were avoided.[1]

Vv. 9 and 10 close this section. Manifestly here, as above in vv. 1 and 5, by the וַיִּבֶן of both verses, the temple house is distinguished from the wings, and these are added as an appendage, belonging indeed to the temple and destined for its use, but still altogether subordinate to it. The words וַיִּסְפֹּן וגו׳, which I, i. p. q. p. 64. Not., understood of the wainscotting of the temple with cedar, I can now, after repeated careful examination, only understand, with the Chald., Syr., Vulg.. Arab., Theod., Procop., Münster, Cler., and many others, of the roofing of the house, and render: "and he covered the house with beams and boards of cedar."[2] The necessity of this view arises *(a)* from the contrasted relation of the two verses. V. 9 treats of the temple house, v. 10, of the attached wings. Accordingly as nothing is said in v. 10 of the roof of the temple, it is natural to understand the words in question, v. 9, of this. For these can *(b)* by no means be understood of the internal wainscotting, since the following section, from v. 15, first treats of this. Finally *(c)* this view is confirmed by the use of the word ספן. ספן, identical with שפן, Deut. xxxiii. 19, and related to צפן, hide, conceal, thus means, properly, hide, conceal. This fundamental meaning we find still in Deut. xxxiii. 21, "and he saw that the portion as-

[1] Windows are not mentioned in the side chambers, but they could not possibly be altogether wanting, even if these chambers only served for keeping the priests' garments, the temple furniture (vii. 51, 2 Ki. xi. 10; 2 Chr. v. 1) and other sacred objects and relics.

[2] שְׂדֵרוֹת, properly rows, 2 Ki. xi. 8, 15, 2 Chr. xxiii. 14, thus here, cedar boards and planks. Between the beams the boards were inserted in rows.

signed to him of the lawgiver was hidden," (סָפוּן.) Hence is derived the meaning, cover, which the word has not only in all other passages of the Old Testament,[1] but also in the Talmud, comp. Buxtorf, lex. chald. rabb. talmud. p. 1527.—In the present passage therefore ספן cannot mean board, or overlay with wood, because for this is used, v. 15—20, the verb צִפָּה, which also signifies the overlaying of the walls with gold, v. 20, 21. Farther, קִירוֹת סִפֻּן, v. 15, means walls of covering, and סָפֻן בָּאָרֶז, vii. 3, a covering of cedars over the chambers. Comp. still, vii. 7.

V. 10. קוֹמָתוֹ, its height, that is, the height of the single story. By an inexactness arising from brevity, the suffix is referred to הַיָּצִיעַ, although this here denotes the whole building

[1] Fürst, indeed, *Concord s.v.* gives as the first meaning: *concamerare, fornicare*, to arch, board over; but this he founds upon its uncertain derivation from a root *pan, ban* with *sa* = *con*. The meaning also assumed by Gesen. and Winer after Kimchi, *texit*, is not fundamental but derivative, though it became prevalent in the later usage. This it has also in the only two passages in which it occurs beyond the present section, namely, Hag. i. 4; Jer. xxii. 14. In the former modern expositors, indeed (Rosenm., Maur., Hitzig, Ew.), generally render, "is it a time for you to dwell in your wainscotted (סְפוּנִים) houses?" But without warrant. For even should ספונים actually belong as an adjective to בתיכם, as an adjective without an article is sometimes joined to a definite neun, (comp. Gen. xxxvii. 2; Ps. cxliii. 10, and Ew. Gramm. § 537), still it must surprise us, that the prophet should at once presume, that all the houses in Jerusalem were wainscotted, or covered with costly boarding scarcely fifteen years after the return of the exiles into their desolate country, where the whole condition of Jerusalem was still deplorable and wretched in the extreme. Rather must we render, "to dwell in your covered (that is, well-secured) houses," while the house of God lies waste. Do you care only for yourselves, the prophet means to say, that ye may live well sheltered under roofs, but have no solicitude for the house of God that it may be built again? In Jer. xxii. 14, also סָפוּן בָּאָרֶז may be suitably rendered, *covered with cedars*, although here also the moderns give *wainscotted*. Even the derivative סְפִינָה, Jon. i. 5, signifies not *navis, a tabulando et affabre elaborando*, (Winer), because v. 3, 4, 5, אֳנִיָּה is used for this—not even *talem (navem), qualem Plinius tectam, Cicero, (Verr.* v. 34), *et Caesar (bell. civ.* 3, 101*), constratum, Graeci κατάφρακτον vocant*, (Winer), but *the deck* of the ship, *quod Graeci στέγην et κατάστρωμα, Plautus stegam, Petronius constratum navis dicunt.*

consisting of three stories. וַיֶּאֱחֹז וגו׳, "and it (the wing) rested on the house with beams of cedar." *Adjunctumque erat domui lignis cedrinis.* Cler. *Adhæsitque domui per ligna cedrina.* Seb. Schm. Untenable is the rendering; *contabulavit* (Gesen.), or *contignavit domum*, which Winer understands of the roof as the closing of the building, after the Chald. and the Vulg., which render אָחַז directly by *cover*. אָחַז means neither *cover* nor *close*, not even in the single passage cited for it by Gesen. and Winer, Neh. vii. 3, as we may perceive from this, that Nehemiah uses סָגַר of the shutting of the gates, xiii. 19. אחז confessedly means, *to seize, lay hold of, grasp, hold fast*, and is construed either *c. accus. rei et pers.* (Judg. xii. 6; 2 Chr. xxv. 5), or oftener still with בְּ. The author here chose the *constr. c. accus.* because he had used אָחַז בְּ in the sense, *fasten in*. The meaning is: because the beams of the side stories rested on the ledges of the temple wall, the wing was attached to the house, it was connected with the temple, without however interfering injuriously with the sanctuary.

In vv. 11—13 is communicated a word of the Lord, which Solomon received during the building of the temple (see the *partic.* בֹּנֶה v. 12.)[1] The Lord assures him that he will fulfil the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii.) in regard to the building of the temple on condition that he will walk in his statutes, judgments, and commandments, which are enumerated according to ii. 3 in the law of Moses, comp. Hävern., Einl. i. 2, p. 581. This word of the Lord is a short Divine confirmation of that which his father David had impressed upon him in the trans-

[1] Probably through a prophet, not, as Schultz thinks, *noctu sine dubio in somniis.* Against this is chap. ix. 3, compared with iii. 3. Calmet asserts, that this revelation follows immediately after the consecration of the temple, and coincides with that mentioned, ix. 2 ff. But the position of our section is decidedly against this. The author has introduced it in the narrative of the building of the temple between the description of the outer building and the internal finishing, in order to show that this word of the Lord came to Solomon during the building for the purpose of calling to his memory in the process of building, that the true service of God consists not in the costly erection and embellishment of a stone sanctuary, but in the faithful following of the Divine commandments.

ference of the kingdom with special reference to the building of the temple. הַבַּיִת is *nom. absol.* "as to this house, which thou buildest, if thou . . . I will perform my word with thee which I . . . And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake my people Israel." Literally David had not received this last promise, 2 Sam. vii. 12 ff., but only that the Lord would establish to his son for ever the throne of his kingdom. But implicitly this contained the most glorious promise for the whole people, to which David also points in his thanksgiving (v. 26.) With right, therefore, might the addition of the Lord's dwelling in the midst of Israel be designated as a confirmation of the promise imparted to David, though this addition agrees in words much more closely with Lev. xxvi. 11, where the highest blessing of true obedience to the commandments of God is compared in the words: "I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul will not abhor you." The dwelling of God among Israel refers to his symbolic presence over the mercy-seat in the most holy place, in which the true spiritual connexion of the Lord with his people was represented.

Vv. 14—35. The completion of the building by the internal finishing of the temple. V. 15. The inner walls of the house are covered from the floor to the ceiling with cedar boards; the floor itself is laid with cypress boards, so that no stone is seen within, comp. v. 18.—V. 16 f. The whole internal space is so divided by a wall of cedar boards from the floor to the walls of the ceiling (עַד הַקִּירוֹת v. 16 is to be understood according to עַד קִירוֹת הַסִּפֻּן v. 14), that the rear apartment is twenty cubits long and broad, but the front forty cubits.[1] The former

[1] These forms are full of meaning. In and of itself certainly no symbolic import is to be sought in the quadrangle, as the oldest temples of the East were all of a quadrangular form, and round temples in general and also in the West were of later origin, comp. Winklemann, Baukunst der Alten i. § 30 and Bähr, Symbol. i. p. 238. But the import of the forms appears from this, that the proportions of the tabernacle are preserved also in the temple; the holy of holies is in both a complete cube, the holy place an oblong deviating only in the height. The proper import, however, is disputed. The meaning assigned by Bähr (Symbol. i. p. 155 ff.) to the number four, namely "the number of the world as the sum of all that is created," has been contested by Hävern., Comm. on Ezek. p. 690, as unfounded and

is designed for the inner room (דְּבִיר comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 318 and

incapable of proof from the Old Testament (comp. also Hengstenb. die Gesch. Bil. p. 71), and for the number four, as well as the quadrangle he claims only the general meaning of "the regular, fixed and definite, absolutely limited and unchangeable." This, however, does not explain the cube form, which the holy of holies had not only in the tabernacle, but also in the temple, and which even in Rev. xxi. 16 is ascribed to the city of God coming down from heaven to the new earth, as this is described not merely as a complete square, but as a perfect cube ("the length and the breadth and the height of it are equal") of 1200 stadia or 144,000 ells (of five feet) in every dimension, comp. Wieseler in Ullm. and Umbr. theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1839, part. 4. p. 1154 ff. Hävernick indeed only finds herein with Vitringa (Ἀνάκρισις *Apocalyps.* p. 899) the *ecclesiæ firmitatem et statum ejus* ἀμετακίνητον *sive* ἀσάλευτον, *immotum* (Hebr. xii. 27, 28) symbolized. But he has neglected to observe, that Vitringa not only recognizes the cubic form of the heavenly Jerusalem acknowledged by himself after Wieseler, but expressly remarks: *Quod autem additur:* longitudinem, latitudinem et altitudinem urbis esse æquales, *neutiquam ita accipiendum est, acsi ipsius urbis, h. e. ædificiorum altitudo exsurrexisset ad* 12,000 *stadia* (so Vitringa reads with the *text. rec.* Rev. xxi. 16, whereas Wieseler i. p. q. has proved that 1200 should be read); *quod ut paradoxum sic plane inconcinnum esset et hujus perfectæ urbis* συμμετρίαν *turbaret: nec referendum etiam videtur ad altitudinem montis, cui urbs fuit superstructa: quippe de quo nihil monetur; sed ut prudentes (?) interpretes cum Grotio jam observarent: ut longitudo et latitudo urbis erant æquales, sic pariter æqualem fuisse visam ædificiorum urbis altitudinem.* On the contrary, Wieseler has already perceived that the description is to be understood not literally but symbolically. "In this cube form, however," says he, "is expressed the prominent thought, that as of the temple edifice only the holy of holies, in which God himself dwelt, had the cubic form, was 20 cubits long, 20 cubits broad, and 20 cubits high (1 Ki. vi. 20), God so dwells in the new Jerusalem as in a holy of holies, united in the most intimate manner with the souls of believers. Then is every temple service to cease, Rev. xxi. 22; then begins the immediate vision of God, xxii. 4." From the whole the cube appears to us the symbol of the dwelling of God, though neither in heaven nor even on earth, but the dwelling of God in the midst of his people, the symbol of the complete kingdom of God, in which heaven and earth are united. The cube-formed heavenly Jerusalem on the new earth is, according to Rev. xxi. 3, ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Next to the cube stands the square, and next to this again the regular oblong. The temple, as well as the tabernacle, was, regarded as a whole, an oblong: the tabernacle is 30 cubits long, and 10 cubits broad, and its court 100 cubits long, and 50 broad: the temple, without vestibule and wings, is 60 cubits long, and 20 broad; the inner court of it probably 200 cubits long, and 100 broad, see i. p. q. p. 115 f. If with this we compare Ezekiel's vision, not only the sanctuary seen by Ezekiel forms a complete square of 500 reeds, comp.

Delitzsch, *Jesurun*, p. 87) or most holy place: the latter forms

Ezek. xlii. 15—20, xlv. 2, and Hävern. Comm. p. 687, but also the portion of land set apart in the new division of the country as a holy tribute or free-will offering of Israel for the sanctuary, the priests and Levites, for the city and its servants, is an area of 25,000 reeds square, Ezek. xlviii. 8, 20; the city Jerusalem also lying in this holy ground over against the temple is a square of 4500 reeds; and the suburbs are to include 250 square reeds, vv. 16, 17. Here the import of the square comes into view. But is it thereby to be merely indicated, that the temple rises regularly and securely from its foundations, that its form and stability thereby represented are correspondent with its whole magnitude? By no means. The stability of the new city is sufficiently indicated, partly, by the walls surrounding it (Ezek. xl. 5; Rev. xxi. 16), to which in the heavenly Jerusalem the twelve θεμέλιοι (vv. 14, 19 ff. comp. with Eph. ii. 20) are added, partly by its situation on a very high mountain, Ezek. xl. 2, on which also the heavenly Jerusalem lies, Rev. xxi. 10. Häv. erroneously observes, p. 690, What in the Apocalypse is transferred to the height of the walls, Ezek. expresses by the height of the mountain on which the temple stands.—If we farther compare the whole delineation by Ezekiel with the present description of Solomon's temple, we cannot fail to observe this great difference, that the external circumstances of the temple, the courts with their cells and doors, guard-rooms and chambers, its ornaments, dresses, &c., are much more carefully and exactly measured and described than the holy place, and the holy of holies of the temple itself, of which the description is surprisingly brief, whereas in the temple of Solomon the courts are scarcely mentioned. That this difference is not accidental, but that in this proportion the fundamental idea, which the prophet pursues in his representation, is put prominently forward, has been rightly remarked by Hävern. i. p. q. p. 668 f. With this is connected the repeated mention of the square form of so many different places of the courts, as well of the inner (Ezek. xl. 23, 27, 47) as the paved area of the outer court surrounding the former (xl. 19), of the separate area on which the temple itself stood (xli. 13—15), of the chambers by the outer eastern gate (xl. 7), of the table for the sacrificial requisites, &c. What else is indicated by this, but that the temple is to be most holy in its entire extent? (Comp. Hävern. i. p. q. p. 623.) But still it does not perfectly correspond to this idea. Still there is the difference between courts and temple, between the holy and the most holy place, and even if the most holy place is no longer separated by a vail from the holy (comp. Hävern. p. 669), even if the court have obtained a much higher import than in the temple of Solomon, yet still a great difference remains between the court, the holy and the most holy place, and therefore the square form is only predominant, not pervasive. For even the temple of Ezekiel is only a copy of the restored and renovated kingdom of God in Israel. For the same reason also in Ezekiel xlvii. and xlviii. the temple and the city are still distinguished, although both stand side by side on holy ground in the midst of

the exterior sanctuary (לִפְנַי anterior, comp. Ew. Gramm. § 343). —V. 18. "And the cedar wood within the house was (carved), sculpture of bitter-gourds and opened buds." מִקְלַעַת פְּקָעִים carved work, sculpture in relief of gourds. On פקע comp.

the land. The glory of the Lord enters into the temple, fills the whole temple, and is directed from the temple to the city; the city is called xlviii. 35, מִיּוֹם יְהוָה שָׁמָּה, but still it has not so become the dwelling place of the Lord, that it no more needs temple, as the heavenly Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 22: therefore also the external form wants its completeness, the height corresponding to the length and breadth. After so many facts, who could doubt that the quadrangle is in Scripture the symbol of the kingdom of God on the earth, and in its several steps, the oblong, the square, and the cubic represent the several steps of the kingdom of God from its first earthly formation to its completion in the end of days? The same symbolic import of the number four, the significance of which Winer bibl. R. W. ii. p. 827, and Hävern. i. p. q. p. 691 incorrectly deny, shows itself, not to speak of the *four* coverings of the tabernacle, the *four* garments of the priests, the twice *four* pieces of the high priest's official costume, the *four* ingredients of the holy ointment and many others, most clearly in the cherubim seen by Ezekiel in the throne of God. Not only are there *four* cherubim, but every cherub has *four* faces, *four* hands, *four* wings, whereas to four faces belong properly eight hands and eight wings (i. 6—10.) Here also it is not sufficient to say: "the remark of Calvin concerning the number of the cherubim: *quod numerum spectat, non dubito quin Deus voluerit docere, diffundi suam virtutem per omnes mundi plagas*, must admit of an appropriate application to the fourfold form of the face. Every cherub is thereby again an individual representative of the creation and of the life lying in it," Hävern. i. p. q. p. 18. For if the cherubim are the ideal representatives of the creation, and "the whole plenitude of the creative living power is shown not only in their whole appearance, but also in each individual and so again in its several parts" (Häv. i. p. q.), the number four, which is not conformable to reality, but merely expressive of the idea, must represent the ideal creation and be the signature of the world corresponding to its idea, that is, of the kingdom of God on the earth. Accordingly the number four and the quadrangle is the symbol not of the world as such, as it is in heathendom, but of the kingdom of God, or the world only in so far as it is to become, or has already become, a kingdom of God. In correspondence with this the most holy place has the form of the complete quadrangle, the cube, for here dwells the Lord, and his people, in the person of the high priest, appear before him, in order to effect once every year through the atonement communion with him, as it will continually subsist in the perfected kingdom of God. The holy place is an oblong, corresponding to its idea, to be the place of the people, who appear before the Lord and serve him through his consecrated priests (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. iii., p. 635.)

Gesen. *thes.* iii. 1122.—V. 19. לְתִתֵּן is not future with לְ prefixed, *ut reponeres* (Schulz, *Schol.* Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 636, 716), but, as may be clearly seen from xvii. 14, *infin.* תֵּת with reduplicated syllable תֵּן, formed according to a reduplication of monosyllabic words more common in the later language, comp. Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 408. Not. 4 and Hebr. Gramm. p. 226.

V. 20. לִפְנֵי הַדְּבִיר is difficult. The Chald. and Syr. render לפני literally קֳדָם, but without meaning: Cleric. *ad adytum:* Maur. *pro, before* instead of *for,* quite arbitrarily. Seb. Schmidt's exposition also, *et faciebus, s. superficiebus adyti erant,* is not satisfactory. For it would be too strangely expressed, "the surface of the inner room had a length of . . . ," instead of simply saying, "the inner room was 20 cubits long." Luther's view of this verse, "and before the choir, which was 20 cubits long, 20 cubits broad, and 20 cubits high, and was overlaid with pure gold, he boarded the altar with cedars," can only be respectfully dismissed. Though independently of the violence of the construction the author cannot be so understood, because in that case the internal gilding of the holy of holies would only be mentioned by the way as it were *in parenthesi,* which is inconsistent with the whole form of the narrative. By attending carefully to the order of the description it appears, that the gilding of the most holy place forms the main subject of this verse. The לפני הדביר in conformity with the course of the narrative can only be employed as subject in the sense, the inside of the inner apartment. This sense, however, פָּנִים has not; wherefore the rendering of J. H. Mich. *quod ad interiora adyti adtinet* is inadmissible. With Kimchi we take לפני for the construct state of a subst. לפנים, that occurs also, v. 29, in the sense of the inner part, the interior, and is formed according to the analogy of the adjective לִפְנַי, v. 17. The frequent use of לִפְנֵי as a mere preposition caused its origin from the prefix ל and פני to be gradually forgotten, and the form to be regarded as a simple word from which the later speech formed new derivatives.[1]

[1] Older is the derivative פְּנִימָה also formed from פָּנִים *facies,* in the sense of *parietes domus e regione januæ positi, ap. Homerum: τὰ ἐνώπια (Gesen. thes.* ii. 1111), properly towards the inner wall, there-

זָהָב סָגוּר (סְגוֹר Job xxviii. 15), for which stands 2 Chr. iii. 8 זָהָב טוֹב, is shut up, that is, fine, precious gold. There is no ground for other meanings, as, *aurum densatum*, unporous gold (Fürst, *Concord. p.* 755), or, solid native gold (J. D. Mich. after the Arab. شَكَر, or, *igne probe excoctum*), (J. H. Mich. *adnott. uber. in Job* xxviii. 15 after the Arab. سَجَر), which Rosenm. (*Schol. ad h. b.*) rejected, but Ewald has, notwithstanding, again proposed. For as סָגַר has a clearly ascertained meaning in Hebrew, which is also quite suitable here, we should not have recourse to foreign dialects, especially as the explanation ascertained in the Hebrew has an analogy in כֶּתֶם gold, properly the hidden.[1] "And covered the altar with cedars" (מִזְבֵּחַ without the article, because the altar has not been before mentioned.) J. D. Mich. translates falsely, Also the altar of cedar overlaid he with gold; for (*a*) מִזְבֵּחַ is not *stat. constr.*, (*b*) the gilding of this altar is first mentioned, v. 22.—Since the altar was overlaid or covered with cedars, it must have had a centre of stone. Besides the mention of the altar in this verse, which treats of the most holy place, is remarkable, and still more remarkably is this altar, v. 22, described as אֲשֶׁר לַדְּבִיר, "which belonged to the inner apartment (the most holy place)," (for לְ denotes property, ownership, comp. Hengstenb. Comm. on the Psalms, i. p. 151.) Hence Calmet, J. D. Mich., and Dereser inferred, that there was an altar in the most holy place, on which the high priest on the great day of atonement might set the

fore, inward, which is found already Lev. x. 18; and פְּנִימִי, that besides v. 27 and vii. 50, occurs only in Ezek., Chron., and Esther. For against the derivation of this word *a rad.* פנם *celare*, *occulere*, proposed by Fürst *Concord.* p. 911, decides at once the circumstance, that no trace is to be found of the existence of such a root in any of the Shemitic dialects.

[1] According to 2 Chr. iii. 8, 600 talents of gold were employed for the gilding of the most holy place, and 50 for nails. On the gilding of the ancients, comp. Jahn, Archæol. i. 1, p. 230. The upper chambers, also above the most holy plaee, which are not mentioned in the Books of Kings, but are inferred of necessity from the fact that the most holy place was ten cubits lower than the holy, were gilded, see i. p. q. p. 51 f.

censer. Quite incorrectly. Both verses are explained by the statements of the Pentateuch concerning the position of the altar of incense: "And thou shalt put it before the vail, that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony," Ex. xxx. 6, and "thou shalt set the altar of gold for the incense before the ark of the testimony," Ex. xl. 5, while in the same passage, v. 26, it is distinctly said, "he put the golden altar in the tent of the congregation before the vail." By these passages the altar of incense, though standing in the holy place, is set in a closer relation with the most holy place than the two other pieces of furniture in the holy place, the table and the candlestick, which are therefore named alone, Ex. xxvi. 35, as the articles to be placed without the inner vail. This closer connexion, indicated in both these verses, of the altar standing certainly in the holy place, but immediately before the vail, with the most holy place, is shown also in this, that it is not only called Ex. xxx. 10 קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים לַיהוָֹה, but also on the great day of atonement was sprinkled on its horns, and purged with the blood, which was brought into the holiest to atone for the people and sprinkled on and before the mercy seat, Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 18 f.[1]

V. 21. The gilding of the inner wall of the house, that is, the partition between the holy and the most holy place. This alone can be understood by הַבַּיִת מִפְּנִימָה. The connexion demands this. For as v. 20 the interior gilding of the most holy place,

[1] From this close connexion of the altar of incense with the holy of holies is explained also the statement, Heb. ix. 4, that the holiest of all had a χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον, which caused the expositors so much trouble that many fathers of the church, Origen, Augustine, Oecum. actually believed, that the altar of incense had stood in the most holy place (comp. Tholuck's Comm. on the Hebr. p. 281. Ed. 1), others explained θυμιατήριον by censer, for example, Fr. v. Meyer, Bibeldeut. p. i. ff., others still charged the author of the epistle to the Hebrews with ignorance of the arrangements of the Jewish sanctuary, or at best with a false explanation of the above cited passage of the Pentateuch, which—according to Bleek, Epist. to the Heb. iii. p. 488—might be so conceived, "as if the altar of incense had stood not in the holy place before the vail, which separated the holy from the most holy, but on the opposite side of the vail in the most holy place immediately before the ark." The correct view has been already conjectured, but not clearly enough expressed by Mynster (theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1829. part 2. p. 342 ff.) and Tholuck i. p. q. p. q. p. 293.

and v. 22 that of the holy place are described, so in v. 21 the partition wall only can be spoken of. To this point also the very difficult words וַיְעַבֵּר בְּרַתּ׳ זָהָב׳, concerning which the old interpreters have only formed various conjectures. LXX., according to *Cod. Ab.*, render, *καὶ παρήγαγεν ἐν καθηλώμασι χρυσίου κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβείρ*. The *Chald.* gives the passage by the Chaldee words corresponding to the Hebrew, apparently without having understood them. The *Syr.* "he made ܦܪܣܛܕܐ *parastadem;* the *Arab.* still more arbitrarily: "he made for the door of the sanctuary thresholds عتبات."
*Vulg.: et affixit laminas clavis aureis.*[1] Dereser has on the whole correctly hit the sense: "and he let a gold chain-work run (to the wall) before the oracle;" only he does not explain the use of the preposition בְּ. Much rather must we render: "he made to go thereupon (upon the inner partition-wall) in golden chains," that is, he made an ornament running over the partition wall, consisting of gold chains,[2] of the peculiar nature of

[1] Clericus renders: *ante Adytum transmisit catenas aureas,* and understands this of golden chains, which were hung on the walls for ornament; whereas Dathe with a like rendering explains the words: *hæ catenæ ex pariete in ea tantum parte pependisse videntur, in qua ex illis velum, quod adytum a sancto separabat, suspendebatur.* J. D. Mich. after the analogy of the pillars by gold chains found in the mosque at Damascus or the balustrade of metal pillars running round the Kaaba, which are connected with chains on which hang silver lamps, represents the matter thus: "On the walls stood as an ornament pillars in the form of palm trees, and these were connected by golden chains hanging down." Most of the moderns after Vatabl. and Cocceius explain: "he barred with gold chains (the most holy place or the door of it);" thus Schulz *(Schol.)*, de Wette, Gesen. *thes.* ii. p. 984, Winer *(Lex.)* But the folding-doors of the most holy place stood always open, and the view into it was only covered by the vail, see i. p. q. p. 75 f. The signification *repagulare,* also, for עִבֵּר is by no means ascertained in the *Chald.;* for Buxtorf cites for proof merely this passage from the Targum, while it is a question, whether the Targumist actually understood it, although the *substant.* עֲבָרָה signifies the bar (properly that which is laid over.) In Hebrew at least all proof of it is wanting, as the piel עִבֵּר occurs again only in Job xxi. 10 in quite a different signification.

[1] בְּ designates the predicate only in so far as it states in what it consists, comp. Ewald, Gramm. § 521.

which, on account of the brevity of the expression, which is still more indefinite in 2 Chr. iii. 16, no distinct conception can be obtained. The conjectures offered are given i .p. q. p. 76 ff.—V. 22. The whole house, that is, the holy place, along with the altar in it was entirely overlaid with gold.

V. 23—28. For the most holy place Solomon had two colossal cherubim made, ten cubits high, with wings five cubits long, of wild olive tree overlaid with gold, and set up with their faces turned to the holy place (2 Chr. iii. 13), so that their expanded wings touched the side walls with their external points, and with their internal reached one another, and the ark was placed under them, see i. p. q. p. 105 ff. Among the various explanations of the word כְּרוּב, for which compare Gesen. *thes.* ii. *p.* 710 *sq.* and Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 262 ff., the only tenable one is that given by Aben Ezra, namely, צוּרָה, *forma, imago*, an artistic figure (see i. p. q. p. 107), for which also recently Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 5 has decided. Gesen. l. c., indeed, thinks it wants *apto fundamento*, but it is sufficiently warranted by the Arabic and Syriac usage. "כרובים *sculpta, γλυπτά, ad certissimam originem thematis* כרב كرب *sculpsit*, says A. Schultens, *prov. salom. p.* 472, and ܟܪܶܒ *apud Syros est finxit, unde* ܟܪܘܒܐ *formator imaginum*," *Castell. lex. heptagl. s.v.* and *Lex. et Comment. Serm. hebr. et chald. post J. Cocceium et J. H. Maium ed. Schultz* i. *p.* 610. Comp. still *Gesenius, de Bar Ali et Bar Bahlulo*, ii. *p.* 30.—These cherubim were certainly on the whole true, but colossal copies of the massive golden cherubic forms standing on the capporeth, but with this difference, that whereas the faces of the Mosaic ones were turned towards one another on the capporeth, these directed their faces not to one another but to the holy place, As beings, which, according to the admirable exposition of Bähr, "as standing on the highest step of created life and uniting in themselves the most perfect created life, are the most perfect revelation of God and the Divine life," (Symbol. i. p. 340 ff.), they were the most appropriate symbols of the glory of the Lord filling the sanctuary.[1]

[1] The connexion asserted by Spencer, but decidedly opposed by Bähr, between the cherubim and the Egyptian Sphinxes, even after all that Hengstenb. (d. BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 157 ff.), has alleged in its

In v. 29 f., the decoration of the inner wainscotting of the holy place already briefly mentioned, v. 18, is more completely described. All the walls of the holy place were wrought in figures (carved work) of cherubim, palm trees, and opening buds, clear symbols of growth, bloom and potent life in the kingdom of God, see i. p. q. p. 144. Concerning the probable distribution of this sculpture, see i. p. q. p. 70 ff. מִלִּפְנִים וְלַחִיצוֹן, "from within to without," that is, the most holy as well as the holy. Comp. on מִן—לְ, Gen. ix. 10, and on לִפְנִים the remarks on v. 20.—Even the floor of the holy and the most holy place was overlaid with gold, that is, covered with thin gold plates, see i. p. q. p. 70.

V. 31—35. The door to the most holy place consisted of two leaves of wild olive tree, that moved on golden hinges (vii. 50) and were decorated in the same manner as the inner walls of the temple. The door of the holy place was on the whole similarly constructed, only the leaves were made of cypress-wood and only the posts of wild olive. Farther every leaf was divided into two halves or folds (צְלָעִים),[1] which turned by themselves, so that it was not necessary always to open the whole leaf, in order to enter the holy place. In the door to the most holy place this division was unnecessary, because in the first place this was not opened and shut, but stood always open (see i. p. q. p. 75), and in the next place it was obviously smaller and lower than that to the holy place. Its size indeed is not expressly stated, but it may be inferred from the obscure words הָאַיִל מְזוּזוֹת חֲמִשִׁית v. 31, which Gesen. first in the *thes.* i. p. 42 *sq.*, where also the various opinions of the ancients are to be found, set in a clear light by the rendering: *crepido cum postibus erat*

favour, remains still in the highest degree doubtful, as amidst the total uncertainty concerning the proper and true form of the Mosaic cherubim and their relation to the cherubic figures of Ezekiel, "the essential agreement of form between them can neither be proved nor set aside on convincing grounds." Comp. the certainly in some degree apposite remarks in opposition to Hengstenb. of B. Welte in the Tüb. theol. quart. 1842 part. 2 p. 299 ff.

[1] קְלָעִים, v. 34, is not to be taken with Schulz, Dathe, Maur., Gesen., Winer, for an error of transcription instead of צְלָעִים, but rests upon an Aramaising change of צ and ק, as אַרְקָא for אֶרֶץ, Jer. x. 11.

*quinta pars, i.e. quintam parietis partem occupabat*, the frame of the door with the posts[1] occupied the fifth part of the wall, see i. p. q. p. 77. The door therefore, with frieze, socle, and posts, was 4 cubits broad, and certainly also as high—a size proportionate to a wall 20 cubits high and broad. The entrance to the holy place was considerably greater, as it had posts of wild olive a fourth part (of the wall) v. 23, according to which the door with its frame was 5 cubits broad by 7½ high, so that the leaf might be quite conveniently divided into two separately turning halves. The gilding of the doors is also specially described. Of the leaves of the door to the holiest it is said: "he spread (וַיָּרֶד from רדד) the gold upon the cherubim and palm-trees" (v. 32), that is, according to Jarchi's correct explanation: he laid thin gold leaves over the doors that were covered with sculpture, so that all the figures, elevations, and sinkings of the carved work were expressed and made visible on the gilding. Of the doors to the holy place, it is said, v. 35: "he overlaid (the sculptured cherubim, &c.) with gold fitted upon the sculpture (carved work), that is, so thinly beaten and laid over the figures, that the gold was exactly joined to them."

V. 36. "And he built the inner court, three rows of hewn stone and a row of cedar-beams." This statement is very brief and ambiguous. Chr. (2 iv. 9) says still less about it, but at the same time mentions the outer court, which had its gates overlaid with brass, see i. p. q. p. 111 ff. Most interpreters understand these words of the enclosing of the court which was situated, according to Jer. xxxvi. 10, higher than the outer court surrounding it, which consisted of three layers of cut stone, on which a row of cedar-beams either lay flat or was applied in the form of a railing, see i. p. q. p. 115.[2]

1 מְזוּזוֹת the *Syr.* translates ܦܪܣܛܕ̈ܐ παραστάδες: but they are not pillars, as Gesen. *l.c.* assumes, but square posts, pilasters. And הָאַיִל מְזוּזוֹת does not stand for אֵיל הַמְּזוּזוֹת, as Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 658 thinks, but מְזוּזוֹת is freely attached to הָאַיִל as an explanatory apposition, comp. Ew. Gramm. § 515. Hence also v. 33 מְזוּזוֹת stands alone.

2 J. D. Mich., on the contrary, applies the words to the area of the court, which was formed of three rows, one above another, of large cut

V. 37, 38. From the second month of the 4th year to the eighth month of the 11th year of the reign of Solomon, that is, in 7½ years, for which the text gives the round whole number 7 years, was the temple completed. In comparison with other great erections of ancient and modern times,[1] this building was executed in a very short time. At the same time we are to remember, that, notwithstanding the splendour with which it was finished, the edifice was not in itself very great; that, farther, an immense number of workmen were employed in it; and, lastly, that the procuring and preparing of the material, and the hewing of the stones, were accomplished on Lebanon, and preceded the founding of the temple, and therefore are not to be reckoned in the 7½ years. Besides, the substructions of Mount Moriah necessary for the foundation of the temple and its court, would have required not only the greater part of the time, but the most part of the stones. As Josephus, however, in his accounts of it in three different parts of his writings (*Antiq.* viii. 3, 9, xv. 11, 3, and *de bell. Jud.* v. 5, 1) partly contradicts himself (see i. p. q. p. 34 ff.), and at all events exaggerates the matter, it cannot now be ascertained, how much of these substructions belongs to the work of Solomon and how much to the following centuries; but a considerable part of it at all events is his work, as the remains of it, which Robinson (Pal. ii. p. 58 ff.) has discovered according to its ancient style of building—the grooved bordering of the enormous stones from 20 to 24 and more feet long, and 5 to 6 feet broad—point to the times before the captivity, and in that case certainly originated with Solomon

stones, and a row of thick cedar-beams laid over them, because the priests were obliged to go barefoot in the inner court (comp. *Carpzov. Appar. crit. Antiq.* p. 787 sqq., and *Braun, de vestit. sacerd. p.* 33 *sqq.*), which would have been scarcely tolerable in winter, if they must have gone on the bare stones. But, not to speak of the improbability of so massive a pavement, this view is opposed by the passage 2 Ki. xvi. 17, according to which the court had a stone pavement in the time of Ahaz: and that this was not a subsequent work, but belonged essentially to the court, may be inferred from this, that the external court also of the temple seen by Ezekiel was laid or paved with stone.

[1] According to *Plinius h. n.* xxxvi. 12, all Asia was 200 years building at the temple of Diana at Ephesus, and 400 years engaged in its embellishment, and in Egypt 360,000 men were employed 20 years in the completion of one pyramid.

himself, not only because none of his successors down to the captivity could command so much gold or labour as he, and that which is told us of the new court under Jehoshaphat (see i. p. q. p. 112, and Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 654), and of the repairing of the temple by Joash, 2 Ki. xii. 5 ff.; 2 Chr. xxiv. 4 ff., and Josiah, 2 Ki. xxii. 5 ff.; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8 ff., does not make the impression, that at these periods so costly and massive walls were to be executed, but also because the building of a great and splendid palace on Mount Zion immediately after the temple renders it probable, that the joining of the two hills by means of a bridge, the remains of a great arch of which have likewise been discovered by Robinson i. p. q. p. 64 ff. closely connected with the foundation wall of the mount, and showing a similar style of building, is at all events a work of the reign of Solomon.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### BUILDING OF THE ROYAL PALACE, VV. 1—12, AND MAKING OF THE TEMPLE FURNITURE VV. 13—50.

The first section of this chapter, which treats of the building of the royal palace, is exceedingly difficult on account of its brevity and the want of perspicuous statement. V. 1 is closely connected with vi. 37, 38, and forms the transition from the account of the erection of the temple to the building of the royal palace. The thirteen years, according to ix. 10, are to be reckoned from the completion of the temple. With v. 2 begins the description of this building. As in what follows several buildings, as the house of the forest of Lebanon (2—5), the portico of pillars with a porch (6), the porch of the throne and of judgment (7), the dwelling house of the King, and the house of the daughter of Pharaoh were erected one after another, the question in the first place arises, whether all these buildings were different parts of the one royal palace, or different buildings from it? The former opinion we find in Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 15, 2)

Theodor., Procop., Villalpand. (*ad Ezech. t.* ii. *p.* 431 *sqq.*), Corn. a Lap., Calm., Seb. Schmidt, etc., while on the contrary the Arab. translator (perhaps also the Chald. and the Syr.), most of the Rabbins, Seb. Münster, finally J. D. Mich., Dathe, and Dereser, are of the latter opinion. Of these Mich. and Dathe, with Iken (*dissert. philol. theol.* i. *diss.* 15) and Hamelsveld (bibl. Geogr. i. p. 338) assume as certain, that the forest-house of Lebanon was a summer residence of King Solomon built on Lebanon or at the foot of it, for which Dathe appeals to ix. 19; 2 Chr. viii. 6. Comp. the remarks on ix. 19. But on the contrary Cleric. rightly concluded, from the statement x. 17, that Solomon deposited the golden shields in the forest-house of Lebanon, that this *villa* cannot have been far distant from Jerusalem. *Neque enim tam pretiosa suppellectilia in loco minus tuto reposuisset;* while Villalpand. *l. c.* inferred from xiv. 25, 26, that these golden shields were in the royal palace at Jerusalem. Comp. also Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2, p. 305. But we do not need this argument, which is far-fetched, and has been opposed by Iken *l. c.*, as more convincing reasons lie much nearer. The forest-house of Lebanon cannot be a building different from the royal palace mentioned, v. 1, for this reason, that afterwards (ix. 1, 10,[1] 15, comp. x. 12) only one palace is always named among the buildings executed by Solomon, and thus in case of the forest-house of Lebanon, and the palace built in Jerusalem being different, nothing definite is said of the thirteen years building of the latter, whereas here so large an account is given of the summer palace, which is no farther mentioned in the following chapters. Still more decisive, however, is the relation of the first verse of the chapter to the following. Had the expositors thought of this, that v. 1 is a mere superscription, as vi. 14, no one would ever have proceeded to connect with Dathe the last sentence of v. 1 with v. 2 thus: *quâ absolutâ construxit domum etc.* With v. 2 begins the account of the erection of the building mentioned v. 1; וַיִּבֶן is here, as vi. 14, to be

[1] From chap. ix. 1ᵃ and 10, and the parallel, 2 Chr. viii. 1, Corn. a Lap. drew the right conclusion, that the king's house, the house of the daughter of Pharaoh, and the forest house of Lebanon, were joined and connected with one another, *ita ut non tam tres domus, quam tres partes vel tria membra unius ejusdemque domus esse viderentur.*

rendered, "he built namely." It necessarily follows from this, that the collective buildings mentioned in vv. 2—8 formed only the one royal palace, the several departments of which are described in succession, whereupon the section is concluded with a statement of the materials employed in the building (vv. 9—12.)

But even after the unity of the building has been agreed upon, it is extremely difficult to draw an outline of the entire palace, that will be intelligible, and in conformity with the statements of the text.[1] In vv. 2—5 the principal part of the edifice is described, which consisted in some sort of a forest of cedar pillars, so that the whole palace derived therefrom its name, the forest-house of Lebanon. This structure was 100 cubits long, 50 broad, and 30 high, and was surrounded with a wall of massive hewn stones (vv. 9, 10.) This appears clear as well from the words of the text as from the analogy of Eastern buildings, which are always enclosed with a wall, comp. Faber, Archæol. i. p. 411; Jahn, Archæol. i. 2, p. 199 ff.; and Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 548. But how were the pillars arranged and distributed? From vv. 2 and 3: "he built the forest house of Lebanon . . . . upon four rows of cedar-pillars, and cedar-beams were upon the pillars; and it was covered with cedars

[1] Even Josephus does not know how to deal with the text, and betakes himself therefore, *l.c.*, to a fanciful delineation of the building, speaking of pillars supposed to be formed in the Corinthian style, of sculptures wonderfully adorned with leaves and branches, of magnificent cooling groves and the like, not a syllable of which is in the biblical text. Villalp. afterwards followed these fancies more than the biblical text in his description (*l.c.*), provided with a ground plan, which is not in the remotest degree connected with the text. The other expositors have contented themselves with aphoristic remarks on several verses, without even making the attempt to form an idea of the building. Even the modern biblical archæologists, Jahn, Hofmann, De Wette, have not ventured upon this, and therefore it is not to be wondered at that enquirers unacquainted with Hebrew are either silent in regard to the ancient architecture of this palace, as Stieglitz, in his Beitr. z. Gesch. d. Bauk. der Alten, or only mention it briefly, without attempting any description of it, as Hirt, d. Gesch. d. Bauk. bei. den Alten, i. p. 126, Schnaase, Gesch. d. bild. Künste i. p. 247, and Fr. Kugler, Hdb. d. Kunstgesch. 1842, p. 83 f. Faber only has in his Archæol. of the Hebr. given a description of this palace, which, however, irrespective of several demonstrable errors, is unsatisfactory for this reason, that according to it the building proves so small that King Solomon could not possibly find room in it.

above upon the side chambers, which were upon the pillars, 45 (pillars), 15 the row;" is derived the following representation of it: the building consisted of side chambers (צְלָעֹת comp. vi. 5), which were built upon the pillars, and indeed upon four rows of pillars. This can scarcely be otherwise understood, than that the side chambers of the one side, or the chambers of each wing rested inwards on two rows of pillars, while the beams at their outer ends caught upon the enclosing walls and were partly supported by them. The three rows of cedar pillars, (v. 3), of which 15 made a row, are to be conceived standing one over another, according to which the building had three stories, of which the lower consisted of a double colonnade formed by the two rows of pillars of each side and the enclosing wall, but the two upper had each a row of chambers with a gallery[1] formed by the pillars. Thus is explained the statement of the four rows of pillars and 45 pillars, 15 the row, of which the ancient translators and most of the modern expositors could make nothing, so that several of them either proposed or proceeded to alter the text in an arbitrary manner. If the under rows of pillars, on which the side-stories rested, were counted, there were four rows; but if the pillars standing one above another were counted, there were three rows on each side, each consisting of 15 pillars.[2] That these 45 pillars distributed into three rows, stand one over another, appears from vv. 4 and 5; "And beams in three rows and view against view three times. And all the doors and posts were squared of beams, and front-view against view three times."[3] Three rows of beams and a threefold *vis à vis* can only be under-

[1] This gallery is not mentioned indeed in the text, but must certainly be assumed, in order to explain the free position of the pillars in the two upper stories of the side chambers.

[2] If the 15 pillars of each row be conceived distributed over a length of 100 cubits, the distance from one to another would amount to somewhat more than six cubits. Now if we assume for the breadth of the under portico the like measure, there remains in the midst an open space of about 25 cubits broad, which is sufficiently large in relation to the whole breadth of the building, which was 50 cubits.

[3] There is great obscurity in the words: מֶחֱזָה אֶל־מֶחֱזָה שָׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים, v. 4, and מוּל מֶחֱזָה וגו׳, as the word מֶחֱזָה occurs only here, though the *rad.* חָזָה is well known. Gesen. and Winer (*lex.v.*), explain it with the modern expositors by window; but this meaning

stood without subtilty of three stories. In favour of this is also the height of the whole building, which was 30 cubits; cedar pillars of this height are not to be found in any ancient building, especially if they are to bear any thing.[1] If on the contrary we distribute the height of 30 cubits into three stories, each story, if we allow the beams to be a cubit thick, and consequently each pillar will be about 7 cubits, or 11⅜ Paris feet high, if the three stories were of equal height. But the building gains in symmetry, if we suppose the undermost row of pillars longer and the upper shorter, while the side chambers would still be sufficiently high for being inhabited.

V. 6, 7. Before this building was a portico, 50 cubits long and 30 cubits broad, and before this portico again a porch with pillars and a threshold pediment. According to the analogy of the temple porch, (vi. 3), we must conceive the given length to run parallel to the breadth of the forest-house, so that the porch was properly 50 cubits broad and 30 cubits deep.[2] This analogy, as

is no better founded for מחזה than for שְׁקֻפִים, which many of the ancients also render by window. None of the old versions has assigned this meaning to the word, however differently they have explained it. LXX: *καὶ χῶρα ἐπὶ χῶραν τρισσῶς*, v. 4, and *καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θυρώματος ἐπὶ θύραν τρισσῶς*, v. 5. *Chald:* וְזָוִי לָקֳבֵיל זָוִי תְּלָת זִמְנִין, *et angulus e regione anguli tribus vicibus.* *Syr.* ܡܩܒܠܝܢ ܬܠܬ ܙܒܢܝܢ, three times mutually corresponding or opposite. Similarly the *Vulg.* and *Arab.*—מֶחֱזָה means nothing but *aspectus* or *prospectus*, view to or from, whereby certainly the meaning of מחזה אל־מחזה may be differently conceived. For we may conceive these words in both verses to be explanatory of the first half of the verse, and understand מחזה of the visible ends of the projecting beams (שְׁקֻפִים from שָׁקַף to be prominent, project), as Jarchi, in the *Comment. lat. vers. a Breithaupto*, or regard it as independent, and understand מחזה of the front of the edifice between the projecting beams.

[1] In the ruins of Persepolis, indeed, are found pillars 44 (English) feet high = about 27 Hebrew cubits, but these are, it is well to remark, not of wood but of stone, and even with regard to them Schnaase, i. p. q. p. 221 remarks, that for bearing a roof "this weak fragile form was very unhappily chosen."

[2] Probably from the circumstance, that the length of the portico was exactly half the length laid down for the whole building. Faber was led, i. p. q., to set back the portico into the building, against which arrangement, besides the name אוּלָם, which always denotes only the

also the name אוּלָם, decides also concerning its position relative to the main building, that as its portico it must have been built before it. It was likewise, according to v. 12, surrounded with a wall, perhaps so that the front and the two sides had special walls, but the rear or the wall opposite the entrance was formed by the wall which separated the main building from this portico. The walls of the portico, according to v. 12, consisted of three rows of hewn squared stones and a row of cedar beams, from which we may conclude with tolerable certainty, that it was lower than the main building, and also consisted of a single row of pillars or a single colonnade on each of the four sides. Its height is not given in the text, any more than the height of the temple porch; though we must not imagine it too low, as the square stones employed for the whole building, according to v. 10, were of ten cubits and of eight cubits, so that, if they were not hewn completely square, they must have had a height of four or five cubits. Before this portico is still a porch (אוּלָם עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם) with pillars and a threshold basement (v. 6.) The second עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם corresponds to the first, and the *plural suff.* refers to אוּלָם הָעַמּוּדִים, but is grammatically connected not with the *nomen regens*, but the *nom. rectum.* This porch formed the grand entrance to the whole palace, and consisted probably of nothing more than a handsome portal of pillars, that is, of pillars and a pediment thereto of cedar wood. Concerning עָב, which the Chald., here and Ezek. xli. 25, explains by סְקֻפְּתָא, pediment of a threshold, comp. Gesen. *thes.* ii. *p.* 977.—The throne porch, mentioned v. 7, in which the king gave judgment, on account of which it was called the porch of judgment, is in all probability identical with the grand portico, or at least a part of it, namely, that in which the throne described, x. 18 ff., stood. This may be inferred from the fact, that neither its size nor its situation is indicated.—וְסָפֻן בָּאֶרֶז וגו׳, "and it (the porch) was covered with cedars from floor to floor." מֵהַקַּרְקַע עַד־הַקַּרְקַע,

erection before the main building, the comparison of vi. 2 and 3 decidedly speaks. If in the temple the length of the porch is not to be included in the 60 cubits, which are the length of the sanctuary, as is generally admitted, neither is this to be done here.

Gesen. (*thes.* iii. 1210) after the *Syr.* and the *Vulg.* explains: *a fundo ad lacunar (quod conclavium superiorum fundus est)*, from one floor to another, *i.e.*, *in omnibus parietibus ab imo ad summum.* Scarcely correct. For how can a portico be conceived with all its sides covered from the floor to the roof, since סָפַן is used, not of wainscotting or covering the walls with cedar boards, but only of the covering of the house, the roof, or of the flooring, as the covering of the floor and foundation (comp. on vi. 9)? קַרְקַע also could only signify the ceiling of the chamber, on condition that it was at the same time the floor of the chamber above, and therefore not in a portico, which has no upper chamber. The words can only mean, from one end of the floor to the other, that is, over the whole floor (Cler., de Wette, and others), or else the one floor as well as the other, that is, in case the throne-porch formed only a part of the portico, the floor of the throne and judgment-porch, as well as the remainder of the portico, or the portico and the porch before it.

V. 8. "And his house, where he dwelt in the other court within the portico, was of the like work. And he made a house for the daughter of Pharaoh, whom Solomon had taken, like unto this portico." Here there is much that is obscure. From analogous cases we are to conclude that the house of Pharaoh's daughter was not a separate building from the dwelling-house of Solomon, but only a distinct part of it, built either behind or above it, perhaps, also, only a wing of the building,[1] the *Gynæceum*, which is otherwise called בֵּית נָשִׁים, Esth. ii. 3, 9. The dwelling-house for the king and queen are in the other court (חָצֵר[2] הָאַחֶרֶת) within or behind the portico, that is, in the court (חָצֵר *locus circumseptus*) formed by the so-called forest-house, for this lay within and behind the portico, and might be designated as the other court in relation to the court formed by the portico itself. In the forest-house, however, as the rows consisting of

[1] The women in the East dwell usually in the interior or back part of the house, but also in the upper story, comp. de Wette Lehrb. d. hebr. jüd. Archæol. p. 148 (3d ed.)

[2] חָצֵר is a prepositional word loosely annexed to the whole sentence for the definition of the place, comp. Ewald, Gramm. § 149 and on the want of the article § 537.

15 pillars fill up the 100 cubits, which is the whole length of the building, and with a twofold colonnade on each side of the length there remains certainly the necessary space for the open court but not for the dwelling house, the residence for the king and queen must have been built at the rear wall of it, so that this rear wall of the forest-house formed at the same time the front wall of the dwelling-house. By this means the stories built on the two sides of the forest-house first acquire the character of wings, which secured to the apartments therein the name צְלָעֹת side-chambers, while the dwelling-house of the king and queen, built in the rear, formed the centre of the whole palace.[1] Of the nature, size, and internal arrangement of this dwelling the indefinite and ambiguous words, "it was of the like work—like unto this portico," afford little explanation. Wherein consists the likeness is stated, vv. 9—11, "All these were of costly stones, according to the measures of hewing, etc." According to this the collective principal parts of the palace had massive walls of great hewn squared stones,—a large building supported only on wooden pillars every storm might have overturned. The square stones employed for the walls were "sawed with saws within and without," because not only several walls formed on both sides inner walls of the building, but also the whole building was surrounded with a great court, "and from the foundation to the copings (טְפָחוֹת comp. Gesen. *thes.* i. 553), and from without to the great court." From these words it follows, that not merely the walls from the foundation to the roof-beams were constructed of great hewn stones, but also the great court around the building was flagged with square stones. Concerning the great court it is also v. 12 remarked, that it consisted all around of three rows of hewn stones and a row of cedar-beams, as the inner court in the house of the Lord and the porch of the house. The three rows of square stones and the row of cedar-beams formed in it, as in the inner temple-

[1] If the whole building did not want its centre without the assumption of a residence in the rear of the two wings, we might, according to the analogy of the above v. 7 conjectured identity of the throne and judgment porch with the portico, throw out the farther conjecture, that the residence of the king and queen is to be sought in the צְלָעֹת v. 3.

court (vi. 36), the fence or outer wall. It must, therefore, also surround the whole building, because, if it were the inner court of the building, it could have had no surrounding wall, but the surrounding buildings or porticoes must have been its boundaries. The phrase לְאֻלָם הַבַּיִת refers not to the temple porch, but to the portico of the palace, the enclosing wall of which was of the same description with that of the court.

From v. 13 is described the temple furniture fabricated by the Tyrian artist Hiram. V. 13, 14. This artist is called חִירָם, as the Tyran king, and bears 2 Chr. ii. 13 and iv. 16 the honourable title אָב, that is, Master, Councillor, comp. Fr. v. Meyer, d. Tempel Sal. p. 50 f.—According to v. 14 he sprang by the mother's side from a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, according to 2 Chr. ii. 13 his mother was of the daughters of Dan. Lundius and others understand this of the city Dan, which was situated in the bounds of the tribe of Naphtali; but the apparent contradiction is as easily solved by the assumption, that his mother was by birth of the tribe of Dan, but was married to a Naphtalite, so that as widow she belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, from which Hiram's father married her. The words הוּא מִמַּטֵּה נַפְתָּלִי Mich. (*adnot. ub. ad 2 Chron. ii.* 3) with Kimchi and other Rabbins explains incorrectly so that Hiram was of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father was called אִישׁ צֹרִי merely on account of his residence in Tyre. אִישׁ צֹרִי is a native Tyrian, or at least so naturalised in Tyre, that Tyre may be counted his native city. The artistic skill of this Hiram is described in almost the same terms as that of Bezaleel, Ex. xxxi. 3 ff., only with the difference, that in Bezaleel it is derived from an inspiration by the Spirit of God, that is, it is described more as a supernatural gift, whereas in Hiram by the indefinite terms, "he was filled with wisdom, understanding, and knowledge" it is described more as a natural gift of God. At all events the author had the passage in Exodus before his eyes. Farther, Hiram is represented here as a worker in brass, in 2 Chr. ii. 13, at the same time as skilled to work in gold, silver and iron, wood and stone, in purple, etc. This difference is explained by the different position of the two accounts. In the present narrative Hiram is only mentioned in the beginning of the section treating of the artistic brazen ware

of the temple, and is therefore described only as a worker in brass. In 2 Chr. ii. 7, on the contrary, Solomon at the very beginning asks the Tyrian king for an artist to fabricate all the artistic works in the temple, and the king sends him Hiram as a man experienced in all the arts requisite for this purpose. Besides the example of Bezaleel shows, that these different kinds of skill might be united in one man, while it is to be remembered that Hiram was only the master, who of course was not alone, but came with Tyrian assistants and executed the works.

Vv. 15—22. The account of the works of art executed by Hiram begins with the greatest and weightiest, the two colossal brazen pillars, which were set up before the temple-porch.[1] These pillars were each 18 cubits high[2] by 12 cubits round, hollow within, of brass four fingers thick (Jer. lii. 21), cast in the thick earth in the valley of Jordan between Succoth and Zarthan (v. 46.)[3] On them were placed (v. 16) cast capitals five cubits high.[4] These capitals were adorned with nets or lattices of lattice work, which is more strictly defined as גְּדִלִים laces, מַעֲשֵׂה שַׁרְשְׁרוֹת chain-work, that is, not twisted lace,—which

[1] On this comp. my above cited treatise (i. p. q.) p. 95 ff. and the older literature in Winer's bibl. R.W. i., p. 616 f. The description of these pillars, especially of their capitals, is certainly to us in many places obscure, but by no means a jumble of confusion of the text and the thought, as Hitzig, d. Proph. Jerem. p. 423, asserts after a very superficial view of the verse.

[2] Concerning the deviating statement of the length given in 2 Chr. iii. 15, see i. p. q. p. 96, note *.

[3] It is surprising, that in v. 15 only the height of the one pillar and the circumference of the other are given, and that it is not remarked that the two pillars were alike. If we compare particularly v. 16, where the height of each capital, notwithstanding their likeness, is separately given, we may certainly assent to the conjecture of Cleric., that in consequence of the ὁμοιοτέλευτον the words: "and 18 cubits the height of the other pillar, and a line of 12 cubits did compass the one pillar," have fallen out.

[4] The specification of three cubits height, 2 Ki. xxv. 17, can be explained neither with J. D. Mich. and Jahn (bibl. Archæol. iii. p. 261) by the fact that the capitals were shortened two cubits in the course of time, nor with the Rabbins, Münster, Grot., and others by this, that only three cubits were ornamented and the other two cubits were plain, but rests upon an old error of transcription, as appears from the parallel passage, Jer. lii. 22.

גְּדִלִים also signifies,—but lace plaited in the form of a chain (comp. جَدِيلٌ a rein plaited of thongs, Amrulk. p. 36, and ܓܕܘܠܐ plaited locks, Song i. 10, 11; 1 Tim. ii. 9, 1 Pet. iii. 3.) Seven such laces were placed on one capital in such a manner that they were wound across one another in the form of festoons, and appeared to the eye as a netformed lattice, as they are copied in the drawing of Fr. v. Meyer (d. Tempel Sal.), only that there two such lattices are erroneously applied the one upon the other. Above and beneath the lattice was bordered by a row of pomegranates encircling the capital (v. 18.)[1] The text, indeed, determines nothing concerning the relation of the two rows of pomegranates to the net-like lattice, though it can scarcely be doubted that the one row ran round the capital under, and the other above it. According to vv. 41 and 42, compared with 2 Chr. iv. 12, 13, there were on the two capitals 400, and therefore on the one 200 pomegranates, so that there were 100 in each row, and indeed, according to the fuller statement of Jer. lii. 23, there were 96 pomegranates to the wind; all the pomegranates upon the lattice were 100 round about, so that four, that probably exceeded the rest in size, were directed exactly to the wind, that is, to the four cardinal points, and the remaining 96 were distributed equably between them round about. Farther it appears from the words גֻּלֹּת הַכֹּתָרֹת, "the bowls of the capitals," used vv. 41 and 42 instead of the simple הַכֹּתָרֹת, that the capitals under the lattice work were not exactly round, but urn or bowl shaped. The second ornament of the capital is thus described vv. 19 and 20: "And the capitals which were upon the top of the pillars (made Hiram) lily-work as in the portico four cubits. And the capitals upon the two pillars also above beside

[1] In the Masoretic text of this verse the words הָעַמּוּדִים and הָרִמֹּנִים are obviously interchanged by an error of transcription, so that we must read with some *codd.* וַיַּעַשׂ אֶת־הָרִמֹּנִים and afterwards עַל־רֹאשׁ הָעַמּוּדִים. So the LXX. appear still to have read, while the Chald. and Syr. had already before them our present text, from which a rational sense cannot possibly be drawn, see i. p. q. p. 98. not.

the belly which was beyond the net-work." With this compare v. 22: "and upon the top of the pillars was lily-work." According to this the lattice work with the rows of pomegranates occupied not the whole height but only the under part of the capital. Beyond, that is, above it, the capital had either a belly and lily-work, or was first bellied and then above bent out and adorned with lily stalks, leaves, and blossoms, by which the upper part of the capital acquired the appearance of a bunch of lilies. The last words, however, of v. 19: "lily-work in the portico (בָּאוּלָם) four cubits," concerning which I can only now repeat the conjecture offered i. p. q. p. 98, Note**, whether it should not be read כָּאוּלָם instead of בָּאוּלָם, and then assumed, that in the portico also an ornament of lilies had been introduced, as in the pillars, and this ornament on the pillars occupied perhaps four cubits of the capital, so that the net-like lattice was only a cubit high.[1] For this emendation the LXX. may be quoted, as it renders בָּאוּלָם κατὰ τὸ αἰλάμ, if we may attach any weight to this version, considering its known loose manner. The Syriac version also appears to express this sense.

[1] On the third copperplate to Hirt's history of architecture among the ancients, fig. 20, is a capital of a column copied from Latopolis with a trellis-formed ornament on the under part, which occupies only a fourth of the top which is bent out and adorned with leaf-work, though the trellis-work is not bellied out nor furnished above or below with promegranates. *Athenæus* also (*Deipnos l.* v. *c.* 9) testifies, that the Egyptians adorned their round pillars with net-work. Not one is found, however, among the numerous capitals of columns copied by Hirt. i. p. q., that has a special resemblance to the present. Kugler therefore i. p. q. p. 81 f. rightly remarks; "The Egyptian forms appear to present little agreement, as on the whole in the plan of the temple there is nothing remarkable that points to an immediate relation with Egyptian architecture. There might be a closer comparison with the pillars of Persepolis; at least here also the capitals of the columns (those which are not formed by the figures of animals) consist of several divisions, and there occurs among them at the same time a kind of pearl-string, which appear to correspond in some measure with the rows of pomegranates." With this we may compare the description of the capitals in the centre hall of the palace of Persepolis (Tschil-Minar) p. 89; the under part has the form of a bellied vessel; above this rises a slender, cup-like member, both are adorned, namely with sticks and strings of pearls." But this resemblance also is too slight to awaken the thought of imitation.

V. 21. These pillars were set up by themselves before the portico (לְאוּלָם, towards the portico, comp. לִפְנֵי הַבַּיִת, 2 Chr. iii. 15, and עַל־פְּנֵי הַהֵיכָל, v. 17), as is recognised also by Kugler, i. p. q. p. 82, and Schnaase i. p. q. p. 280 f., and not in or under the portico, bearing its roof, as Fr. v. Meyer and Böttcher (Proben. p. 334) assume. That they had a symbolic meaning, the names applied to them prove, יָכִין, he will establish, *q.d. stabiliet templum (Simonis Onomast. p.* 430) and בֹּעַז *ex.* בּוֹ עַז *in illo sc. Domino robur (Sim. p.* 460.) Kimchi had correctly explained the first name, *ut stabile sit templum hoc in æternum*, and the second *quasi optaret Salomo, ut Deus ei robur ac subsistentiam largiatur*. The two pillars are accordingly symbols of the stability and strength, which were possessed not so much by the temple as an external building, as the kingdom of God in Israel incorporated in the temple by the Lord, who had chosen the temple for his dwelling place among his people, and their emblems point to the beauty and glory of the dwelling of God, see i. p. q. p. 167.[1]

Vv. 23—26. Comp. 2 Chr. iv. 2—5. The brazen sea, a colossal round (עָגֹל) water basin, which was 5 cubits high, and at the brim (מִשְּׂפָתוֹ עַד־שְׂפָתוֹ, from its one edge to the other) 10 cubits in diameter, so that a line of 30 cubits compassed it. The relation of the diameter to the circumference is stated ap-

[1] The typical meanings assigned to these pillars by the ancients are arbitrary, for example that they denote the two worlds, the visible and the invisible (Ephraim Syrus), or Christ according to his two natures (*Maii œcon. in Michael. annotat. uber. ad 2 Chr.* iii. 17.)—Contrary as well to the usage of the Hebrew language as to the spirit of the Old Testament revelation, Movers (d. relig. der Phöniz. i. p. 293) expounds the names Jachin and Boaz by foundation and movement, and affirms the pillars to be symbols of the resting and fleeing Saturn (!!); but Vatke (die relig. d. A. Test. i. p. 324 and 336) finds in the pillars with their emblems, as in the other furniture of the temple, only Phœnician symbols and emblems of the Tyrian Heracles or Sun-god, regarded as the generative principle of nature; and B. Bauer (die Relig. d. A. T. 11 p. 92) renders this still more definite by the statement, that the pillars "as needles symbolize originally the sunbeams in respect of their penetrating force and power," and bear their names "probably in reference to the irresistible and creative power of the sunbeam"—views, the total groundlessness of which has been already i. p. q. p. 155 ff. pointed out.

proximately in whole numbers, for strictly it is as 7 to 22, or 113 to 335.[1] Under the brim ran two rows of gourds around the vessel, made at the same casting with it, concerning the distribution of which see the details, i. p. q. p. 119.[2] This vessel rested on twelve brazen oxen, which were turned with their heads out, directed every three to a different cardinal point, and probably fixed upon an under-plate of brass, as the Rabbins assumed. The metal of the sea was a hand-breadth thick, and the upper rim of it resembled the work of a cup-rim in the form of a lily-flower. According to v. 26, it contained 2000 baths, according to 2 Chr. iii. 5, however, 3000, a difference, that could only be explained with the older archæologists in this way, that when filled to the very brim it contained 3000 baths, but when filled only to the regular height it contained 2000 (comp. *Deylingi observ. ss.* i. *p.* 127. *Nicolai dissert.* ii. *p.* 14—16), if the differences frequently occurring in statements of numbers, and arising partly through a false reading of numbers originally expressed

[1] As Spinoza (*tract. theol. polit.* ii. *p.* 22) from this mathematically inexact statement of the ratio had raised an objection against the truth of the narrative, the old theologians gave themselves much unnecessary trouble to prove it mathematically exact, thus for example *Reyher* (*Mathes. Mos. p.* 415), *Deyling, observ. ss.* i. *p.* 125 *sqq.* and especially P. Heinr. Nicolai, who, in 2 dissert. *de symmetria maris æenei Salomonis*, *Witeb.* 1717, first contradicts the different opinions, that it was either not quite round but somewhat compressed on both sides, or oval, or hexagonal or cylindrical and hemispherical, and then endeavours to prove, that underneath it was quite cylindrical but above somewhat bent outwards, so that the diameter at the brim was 10 cubits, and the circumference of the cylinder underneath was 30 cubits, in which Schmidt (bibl. Mathem. p. 160) agrees with him.

[2] Instead of פְּקָעִים, v. 24, they are termed, 2 Chr. iv. 3, דְּמוּת בְּקָרִים, the likeness of cattle. As the remaining words run quite alike, the same ornament must be understood by both. The old interpreters endeavoured to reconcile both statements after the example of Kimchi thus: *quod corpus sive substantia colocynthidum fuerit rotunda instar ovorum, et facies sive anterior pars earum fuerit similis capitibus boum*, comp. *Lightfooti Opp. i., p.* 628, and *Mich. annot. ub. ad.* 2 Chr. iv. 3, but this compensation of the difference fails in this, that בְּקָרִים certainly means cattle but not ox-heads. The variation can only be explained by an error of transcription, as the writer of Chronicles found בקרים instead of פקעים already in his source and explained it by דְּמוּת הַבְּקָרִים.

in letters, partly through obvious errors of transcription did not render it more probable, that here also an error of this kind is to be presumed.[1] The brazen sea appears in the temple in the place of the wash-basin in the tabernacle, and served for the priests to wash in (2 Chr. iv. 6), that is, to hold water in readiness, that the priests might wash their hands and feet, if they approached the altar for service or wished to enter the sanctuary, Ex. xxx. 18 ff. The water was probably let into it at pleasure through openings provided with cranes. See the opinions of the Rabbins on this point in Lundius, jüd. Heiligth. p. 356. Twelve, the number of the oxen, had a symbolical reference to the twelve tribes of Israel, that approached the Lord in the Levitical priests.[2]

[1] As the dimensions of the vessel are given in Chronicles quite consistently with our narrative, it is evident of itself, that the deviation in the number of baths contained in it cannot owe its origin to any intentional exaggeration of the writer. Such like assertions therefore, of a rationalistic criticism blinded by prejudice, should not be admitted into scientific works, as Winer's bibl. R. W. ii. p. 84. Besides, if the calculations given by Bertheau (Gesch. der Israel. p. 61 and 73) according to Böckh's metrological researches, from which one cubit should be equal to 234.33 par. lines, and one bath should contain 1985.77 cubic inches of water, be correct; even 2000 baths, the number contained in our text, is much too great, as according to these determinations, a cylinder of 10 cubits height, and 9⅔ cubits diameter, would only contain 1376 baths.

[2] Not, however, to the twelve months of the year, from which Vatke explains this washing basin as a "symbol of time" (*sic.*) From the fact that a Tyrian artist executed the work, it by no means follows, that, as even Hävernick, Comm. on Ezek. p. 26, is inclined to concede, Phœnician ideas must lie at the foundation of his works, as not a single certain trace of this can be pointed out, while, on the contrary, the temple in its chief forms and emblems was copied after the tabernacle, in which an Egyptian influence is more conceivable than a Phœnician. The only demonstrable agreement of the Phœnician architecture with the Israelitish consists in "the custom," as O. Müller, Hdb. der Archaöl. der Kunst, p. 273, 2nd ed. expresses it, "characteristic of these nations to overlay wooden walls or wainscotting over stone walls with gold plating." But to infer from this, that the proper plan of the Phœnician temple may be best estimated from the temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem, that is, in other words, that this temple was built quite after the Phœnician fashion, is a lame conclusion, which only gains some plausibility on the presumption, that the whole history of Israel before David is a pure myth, and the Mosaic tabernacle had no existence, but was copied in the myth from the temple of Solomon and transferred to the Mosaic times, as Vatke actually asserts.

Vv. 27—39. The ten brazen bases with the lavers upon them, which, according to 2 Chr. iv. 6, were designed for washing the things for sacrifice, were made with great art. But the description of them, notwithstanding its fulness, is difficult to understand, and therefore most interpreters have passed over it very briefly, while those who have engaged in it more particularly, as Vatabl., C. a Lap., Calmet, Lightfoot (*Op. i. p.* 644 *sq.*), Patrick, and Poole in the English Bible, and J. Mich. have not given any clear conception of their form.[1] The bases were square chests four cubits long, four broad, and three high; their four sides cast of brass had pannels (מִסְגְּרוֹת),[2] and indeed pannels in ledges or mouldings (שְׁלַבִּים *commissuræ* from the Chald. שְׁלַב *conjunxit*, in Syr. ܫܠܒܐ *vincula*, Ps. ii. 3, then bands or mouldings), which not merely enchased the pannels, but at the same time strengthened the four sides at the angles.[3] V. 29. On the pannels were lions, oxen, and cherubim, and beneath the lions and oxen and garlands (לֹיוֹת *corollæ pensiles* from لوى *flexit, plicuit*, see Schultens, *Proverb. i. p.* 9), מַעֲשֵׂה מוֹרָד pensile work.—The words וְעַל־הַשְּׁלַבִּים כֵּן מִמָּעַל are ambiguous. After the LXX. and *Vulg.*, Dathe and de Wette translate: "and on the corner ledges so above," that is, on the corner or border ledges above are found lions, oxen, and cheru-

[1] Even the old archæologists, as *Lamy, de tabern. foed.*, plate 16, *Villalpandi ad Ezech.* ii. p. 492, *Leusden* in the *philol. mixt.*, *Lundius* (jüd. Heiligth. B. 2 Ch. 15), deviate greatly in their representations from the Hebr. text and from each other; the moderns, Jahn, Hofmann, de Wette, have not entered into any more particular description, and Winer says; "a clear idea of these lavers we shall vainly endeavour to obtain through the descriptions in 2 Ki. vii. 27 ff., or Josephus *Antiq.* viii. 3—6." From Josephus certainly not, who, unconcerned about the Hebrew text, gives a description after the partly unintelligible version of the LXX. and his own fancy; but assuredly from the Hebrew text, as Züllich (die Cherubim-Wagen, Heidelb. 1832, p. 50 ff.), has proved by the fact, even if the figure proposed by him be not in all particulars correct, as Grüneisen in the Tübing. Kunstbl. 1834, No. 5 and 6, has shown.

[2] מִסְגְּרוֹת, Ex. xxv. 25, denotes the boards or pannels in the upper part of the table frame, by which the four feet were connected together, and on which the leaf of the table rested. Comp. Züllich i. p. q. p. 65.

[3] Züllich renders שְׁלַבִּים tenon-work.

bim. But independent of this, that on these ledges there could scarcely be room enough for such figures, is it not plain, what sense is to be attached to מִמַּעַל above? The correct meaning is found in the Chald., which explains כֵּן by בְּנְתָא *basis*. Above the ledges was a base, that is, a stand for the laver placed upon the chest, the description of which follows, v. 31. V. 30. "And four brazen wheels for the one base and brazen axle-trees, and its four feet had shoulder-pieces, under the laver were the shoulder-pieces cast, beyond each one, garlands. V. 31. And the mouth of it (the laver) was within the crown and above it in a cubit, and the mouth of it (the crown) was round, after the work of a base,[1] a cubit and a half, and also upon its mouth was carved work, and the pannels of it (the mouth) were square, not round. V. 32. And the four wheels (made he) under the pannels, and the pins of the wheels in the base, and the height of a wheel was a cubit and a half. V. 33. And the work of the wheels was like the work of a chariot wheel, their pins, and their felloes, and their spakes, and their naves, all were cast. V. 34. And four shoulder-pieces (made he) on the four corners of the one base, of the base (out of it were) its shoulder-pieces. And on the top of the base was a cubit high made round, and on the top of the base were its hands (hand-stays), and its pannels of the same. V. 36. And he cut (graved) on the plates of its hand-stays and on its pannels cherubim, lions, and palms, according to the open space of every one, and garlands round about."

From this extremely literal translation of this obscure passage the following representation is derived. The square chest forming the base stood on the brazen axles of four cast wheels, after the manner of the ordinary chariot wheels, but not immediately on the axles themselves, but on four feet (פַּעֲמוֹת),[2] which were

[1] מַעֲשֵׂה־כֵן which de Wette rightly paraphrases, "after the manner of a pedestal."

[2] From this representation not only the ancient describers of these bases, but also Züllich altogether deviates. The Rabbins explain פַּעֲמוֹת after the Chald. זִוְיָתֵיהּ by corners or corner ledges of the chest. They are followed by most of the old writers, also Luther, de Wette, and others. But Züllich i. p. q. p. 75 with right calls this explanation, "obviously false, because the text called the corners v. 34

fastened to the axles, so that the sides adorned with figures were פִּנּוֹת." The word פַּעַם, pace, step, and in Is. xli. 7, anvil, from the *rad.* פָּעַם beat, stamp, strike, occurs in the sense of any thing made by art besides the present verse only in Ex. xxv. 12, xxxvii. 3, where to the four פַּעֲמֹת of the ark are to be applied rings for the bearing poles. Bähr, in his detailed description of the ark, has quite omitted these פַּעֲמֹת, but Züllich understands by them cross-pieces or brackets, poles, against which, however, Grüneisen has raised the well-founded objection, that all antiquity is ignorant of these, and how then can Züllich know them: "I have never yet found the like either in copies of Egyptian or in those of Persepolitan antiquities. *Schefferus* also, whose experience is great (*de re vehicularia veterum*), has nothing of them, unless from the multitude of ancient vehicles, with which he makes us acquainted, and from the endless variety of their contrivance we may form the conjecture, that the use of such pieces or brackets so generally acknowledged to be serviceable, and therefore so generally extended in the whole modern world, cannot have been altogether unknown to the ancients." But as there is much in most extensive use in the modern world and become quite indispensable to it, which the ancients did not know, under these circumstances we can only admit the assumption of such cross-pieces, if the text and usage of speech necessarily require it. But the speech-usage is decidedly against it; for Züllich himself, in Ex. xxv. 12, explains פעמות by *feet*, *striding feet*, that is, bent outwards as feet spread out for striding, while he remarks farther: "the פעמות had according to this v. (30) כְּתֵפֹת shoulder-pieces, and according to v. 32 יָדוֹת hands, and of the כתפת it is said v. 30, that they (with their under parts) were cast in the *mechonah*, which is repeated v. 34 with the farther particularization, that they rose out of the *mechonah* on its four corners. But of the ידות it is said v. 35, that they also were on the top of the *mechonah* chest of one casting with it, and thus proceeded from it in a downward direction. Now where should the פעמות be besides these כתפת and ידות, if they were not the whole, which is divided into ידות and כתפת, that is, the whole ledge from the axle to the under side of the כִּיּוֹר?"—But if the כְּתֵפוֹת, according to v. 34, proceeded from the four corners of the *mechonah*, that is, were so cast on it, that they—probably of one casting with the lid—appeared to proceed immediately from it, the יָדוֹת, which according to v. 35 were on the head (עַל־רֹאשׁ) of the *mechonah*, and indeed also proceeded from it, could not possibly have been the continuation of כתפות downwards. Therewith fails the whole assumption that the פעמות were identical with the כתפת, that is, ledges.—The פעמות are accordingly, striding feet, that is, feet bent out beneath, which, however, are not merely applied beneath the chests, but as in a table extended on the four corners of the chest-sides up to the lid, so that the

raised above the circumference of the wheels, and the wheels stood under the pannels (v. 32.)[1] Every wheel was a cubit and a half high (v. 32), that is, according to its whole, not—as Züllich assumes—its half diameter, as I have already proved i. p. q. p. 121. It is more difficult to make intelligible the upper part or lid of the base, which formed the foot or stand for the laver. In the middle it had a top or crown (כֹּתֶרֶת) of base-work (מַעֲשֵׂה־כֵן v. 31), into which the laver discharged itself. This top of a cubit and a half diameter had square pannels adorned with the same figured work as the pannels of the sides, and rested upon stays and pannels, that is, on broad plates running from all the four sides to the middle, which formed at the same time the lid of the square chest, and probably ran to the middle not horizontally but in an arched form, whereby their bearing power was increased, from which also they were called stays and plates of the stays (vv. 35, 36.) The intervals between the stays, which are to be regarded as plates pretty broad and adorned with figures, formed the pannels of the lid, which were similarly adorned.[2] Above upon the stays were the כְּתֵפֹת

shoulder-pieces projecting from the lid rested on them and thereby gained bearing power. That, however, the כתפת with their underparts were cast on the *mechonah* is not in the text.

[1] Gesenius in the *thes.* ii. *p.* 972 assumes, that the axles, as in the Roman *plaustra* and to this day in Italy, were fastened to the wheels and turned with them. But it is against this, that (1) the wheels had naves (חִשֻּׁרִים v. 33), whence we must conclude that they turned round the axles (comp. Züllich p. 73); (2) to the wheels belonged יָדוֹת (v. 32) properly hands, that is, pins by which the wheels were fastened in the axles. Cler., de Wette, and Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 567) falsely understand יָדוֹת of the axles of the wheels; for not only are these called סְרָנִים (v. 30), but axles can in no way be denoted by יָדוֹת. And the meaning, pins, is completely established by Ex. xxvi. 17, 19, xxxvi. 22, 24.

[2] As to the distribution of the garlands nothing can be determined from the ambiguity of the words "beyond each one (shoulder-piece) garlands" (v. 30.) In reference also to the sculpture it must be left undecided, whether the palms mentioned only in v. 36 were applied merely on the lid along with the cherubim, lions, and oxen, or also on the side pannels.

shoulder-pieces,[1] namely four strong cast brackets or bars, which, proceeding from the four corners of the chest lid, stretched, with only a slight inclination to the middle of the top, almost directly up to the external rim of the laver resting on the top.—The form and fashion of the laver are more correctly conceived and represented by Villalp. and Lundius than by Züllich, who represents it as an equal-sided cylinder of a cubit and a half diameter and four cubits height (or depth), and then lets it sink so deep into the chest, that only a cubit of it is above the top. Züllich came to this quite incorrect conception from a misapprehension of the very obscure words: "And its (the laver's) mouth was within the top and above it by a cubit" (v. 31). For the mouth of the laver can in no case be the upper part of it, as Züllich assumes; and if this were admitted, the words cannot have the meaning, that the upper part of the laver was a cubit above the top. For then the measure of four cubits given v. 38 must have been understood of the depth or height of the laver, whereas according to the analogy of the measure of the head, v. 31, it is to be understood of the diameter or breadth of it. But if the laver was four cubits broad above, and the head of the base, into which it discharged, only a cubit and a half, we obtain for it the natural form of a bowl expanding very much above, which was four cubits broad at the brim, but underneath was reduced to a cubit and a half.[2] The reduced part of the laver was about a cubit of its whole height, and rose somewhat about the head on which it rested. This is expressed in the words: "its mouth was within the crown and above it in a cubit." But it is called mouth (פֶּה) or aperture, because it fitted and discharged into the crown, which is also called the mouth of the base (v. 31); and from it the water in the laver, as often as it was defiled by the washing of the offerings, was let out into the chest below it, which, when it was full, might be taken away and emptied.—All the ten bases were of the same casting, measure, and form (v. 38.)—On the

[1] Incorrectly and inconclusively Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 725) explains כְּתֵפֹת v. 30 and 34, *cardines axis*.

[2] From this form of the laver is explained also the necessity of the above described shoulder-pieces (כתפות) on the four corners of the base.

situation of these utensils in the inner court (v. 39) see i. p. q. p. 147.

In vv. 40—50 all the articles made by the artist Hiram for the temple, as well the greater, already described at large, as the smaller and larger articles not yet mentioned, are summarily stated;[1] vv. 40—47 the brazen utensils of the court, vv. 48—50 the golden utensils of the sanctuary. The first half of v. 40 belongs to the preceding section, so that the summary enumeration begins first with the second half, as may be seen from וַיְכַל, and still more clearly from the fact, that the articles named in the first half, the pot, shovels, and basins are recapitulated in v. 45. We are surprised by the mention of the כִּיֹּרוֹת v. 40; for that these are not the lavers described v. 38 appears clear enough, on the one hand, because these are first repeated v. 43, and on the other, because in the repetition of this verse in v. 46 instead of כִּיֹּרוֹת, they are called סִירוֹת pots, which name is found here also in Chr. (2, iv. 11.) If we add to this, that in the account also of the furniture of the tabernacle Ex. xxvii. 3, the סִירוֹת are mentioned before the shovels and basins, it amounts to a certainty, that כִּיֹּרוֹת is a slip of the pen for סִירוֹת, comp. Movers Krit. Unters. p. 35 f., although כִּיּוֹר also denotes a small basin for cooking and for coals (1 Sam. ii. 14; Zech. xii. 6), and therefore might be not very different from a pot.—According to Ex. xxvii. 3 pots served for removing the ashes.—מִזְרָקוֹת are basins, wherein the blood of the slain victims was received for the purpose of sprinkling on the altar.—In the description of the tabernacle are mentioned besides forks and fire-basins or coal-pans, which are here omitted.—בֵּית יְהוָֹה in the house of the Lord, comp. Ew. Gr. § 491. In 2 Chr. iv. 11 stands the explanatory בְּבֵית יי׳; and beside v. 45 in 2 Chr. iv. 16 לְבֵית for the house of the Lord.

Vv. 41—44 recapitulate vv. 15—38. Instead of הַמְּכֹנוֹת עֶשֶׂר the ten bases and הַכִּיֹּרֹת עֲשָׂרָה the ten lavers (v. 43) stand in 2 Chr. iv. 14 הַמְּכֹנוֹת עָשָׂה the bases made he and הַכִּיּרוֹת

[1] This section is found agreeing almost to a letter in 2 Chr. iv. 11—22, whereas before the writer had followed another arrangement in the description of the temple. See the note before vi. 1.

עָשָׂה the lavers made he. This deviation rests upon no mere slip but a designed alteration, which the writer found necessary, because he had not described the ten bases in the preceding context; comp. Mover's i. p. q. p. 59 not. The *Kethibh* האהל v. 45 is a mistake for הָאֵלֶּה (*Keri.*)

V. 46. All the brazen vessels were cast in the valley of the Jordan between Succoth and Zarthan, where according to Burkhardt (Reise ii. p. 593) the soil is entirely marl, בְּמַעֲבֵה הָאֲדָמָה in the condensation of the earth. According to Gesen. *thes.* ii. 981: *formæ ex humo densa s. argilla factæ;* correct in general, only we must assume that these forms were dug in the earth and made by the thickening of the soil. Succoth and Zarthan cannot have been far asunder. According to Judg. viii. 5 and Jos. xiii. 27 Succoth lay east of Jordan,[1] probably near its eastern bank, yet not, as Tuch on Gen. xxxiii. 17 asserts without proof, on both banks. Zarthan צָרְתָן, also called הַצְּרֵדָה xi. 6, צְרֵדָתָה 2 Chron. iv. 12, and צְרֵדָתָה[2] Judg. vii. 22, lay not far from Beth-shean (comp. iv. 12) in the valley of Jordan, Jos. iii. 16.—V. 47. וַיַּנַּח he left all these vessels, because they were exceeding many the weight of the brass was not found.[3] הִנִּיחַ to let lie,

[1] As Jerome also *ad Gen.* xxxiii. 17 and in the *Onomast.* expressly testifies, see v. Raumer, Paläst. p. 247. But Succoth is erroneously identified by v. Raum. i. p. q. and Winer (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 629) with the ruins of a place سُكُّوت Sukkot found by Burkhardt (Reis. ii. p. 595) south of Beisan (Scythopolis); for these (*a*) lie according to Burkhardt on the west of the Jordan, where they are marked in the chart by Kiepert in Robinson, not on the east as v. Raum. supposes, and (*b*) even the names are different. سُكُّوت would be in Hebrew שֻׁקֹּט.

[2] So with several *codd.* and the Syriac and Arabic versions must it be read in this place.

[3] The author of Chronicles found this expression too obscure for his readers, and wrote instead of it: Solomon made all these vessels in great abundance (2 Chr. iv. 18). Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 87) incorrectly explains יַנַּח, "he laid them down in the temple." If this were the sense, the statement of the place should not be wanting. In like manner he explains incorrectly the reading of Chronicles as an error of transcription arising from the eye wandering to וַיַּעַשׂ v. 48.

then, to leave unweighed. The immense quantity of brass required for these vessels, some of which were of colossal magnitude, David had taken from the cities of Hadadezer (1 Chr. xviii. 8.)

Vv. 48—50. The furniture of the sanctuary. In v. 48 mention is made only of the golden table, on which the shew-bread lay. In 2 Chr. iv. 10 stands, "the tables," because the making of ten tables and their placing in the sanctuary has been already related. As this verse is wanting in our narrative, only the table, on which the shew-bread usually lay, is mentioned, without implying, however, that there was only one shew-bread table in the temple; much rather the analogy of ten candlesticks speaks also for ten tables, as I have already remarked i. p. q. p. 109 f. Along with the candlesticks, v. 49, are named הַפֶּרַח the flowers or blossoms and הַנֵּרֹת the lamps, which belonged to the candlesticks. The description of these objects is very brief, because in shape and form they were obviously assimilated to the corresponding articles in the tabernacle, and hence are presumed to be known. See the particulars in p. q. p. ff. 108 and Bähr's Symbol. i. p. 407 ff.

Vv. 50, 51. After the completion of the whole building Solomon brought all that David had dedicated to the Lord in gold, silver, and vessels into the treasure chambers of the temple. As so much gold and silver was employed in the building itself, we might be surprised, that Solomon had not expended the treasures collected by his father for this purpose, but was still able to deposit probably no inconsiderable treasure from this source in the treasure-chambers of the temple. But according to 1 Chr. xxii. 14—16 and xxix. 2 ff., David had collected an immense store of gold, silver, and brass for the building of the temple, to which he added still his private treasure and the free-will contributions of the chiefs of the people (1 Chr. xxviii. 13—18.) Solomon also from his own revenues, which, beside the customs of the merchants and the tribute of the confederate nations and governors, amounted annually to more than 660 talents [1,883,750 marks]=£3,613,500 (x. 14) might have contributed a considerable portion to the building of the temple, so that the treasure of the sanctuary, which moreover had been

commenced not first by David but previously by Samuel and Saul, and into which also the generals of David, Abner, Joab, and others had brought a part of the gold and silver taken by them (1 Chr. xxvi. 20—28), was not necessary to be applied to the building. But how much the victorious campaigns of David and his generals may have brought into this treasury, may be conjectured from this, that golden shields were taken from the generals of Hadadezer, and these as well as the silver, golden, and brazen vessels presented by Tou, king of Hamath, as homage-gifts, were dedicated to the Lord along with the silver and gold, which David had dedicated from the conquered Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites, Philistines, and Amalekites, 2 Sam. viii. 7, 11, 12; 1 Chr. xviii. 7, 10, 11.[1]

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE.

This solemn transaction falls into three acts, according to which our chapter is divided into three sections.[2] The solemn

[1] In order to form an approximate conception of the magnitude of such treasures, let us consider, that for example according to *Appian (Parth. 28 ed. Schweigh.)* the temple at Hierapolis in Syria was so stored with riches, that Crassus took several days to weigh the gold and silver vessels, and reflect upon the accounts bordering on the incredible of the immense treasures of the ancient and modern East, which Rosenm. (A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 264 ff.) and Bähr (Symbol. i. p 258 ff.) have collected together.

[2] That references to the Pentateuch occur in our chapter, has been proved by Kanne (bibl. Unters. u. Ausleg.) and Hertz in the tract cited on ii. 3 against de Wette's review of his Beiträgen 3. Einl. ins A.T. Still more profound, though not complete, is Hävernick's (Einl. i. 2. p. 582) recognition of these allusions, so that he remarks; "the speech of Solomon is only to be read and explained by the constant aid of the Pentateuch." Notwithstanding these emphatic indications, de Wette in his embarrassment has only confessed, that he now finds in the whole chapter a resemblance to Ex. xl. 34 f. in v. 10 f., and an allusion to Deut. iv. 20 in v. 51, comp. Lehrb. der histor. krit. Einl. ins. A.T. 5th ed. 1850 p. 213.

removal of the ark, and the other furniture of the old sanctuary into the newly built temple, forms the first act, vv. 1—21; the noble prayer of Solomon, that the Lord would connect with the temple the fulfilment of all the promises made to his people, and thereby make it the true place of the revelation of his covenant grace and truth, forms the second, vv. 22—61; the act of offering makes the third, which is described vv. 62—66.[1]

The first section again contains two elements, (*a*) the act of transferring the ark into the holy of holies, and the old sanctuary and its furniture into the new temple, vv. 1—11; (*b*) the words, in which Solomon celebrated the entrance of the Lord into the new temple v. 12—21.

Vv. 1—7. The ceremony in the removal of the ark rests entirely on the solemnity with which, under David, the ark was conveyed from the house of Obededom to the tabernacle prepared for it on Zion (2 Sam. vi. 12 ff.; 1 Chr. xv. 25 ff.)—Solomon assembles the elders of the people, and all the heads of the tribes, in a word, the princes of all the families, as representatives of the commonwealth of Israel, to himself at Jerusalem (v. 1), whither also all the men of Israel came and appeared at the feast of tabernacles falling on the 15th day of the 7th month, and joined in the dedication of the temple immediately before this feast (v. 2.)—On the form יַקְהֵל com. Ew. Krit. Gramm. p. 542.—According to the Mosaic law the priests bore the ark, the Levites the holy tabernacle with the rest of its furniture, while the king and the people sacrificed sheep and oxen in countless number before the ark (vv. 4, 5.) Properly the law ordained (Num. iii. 31, iv. 5 ff.) only that the ark and other furniture should be borne by the Levites, and in particular by the Kohathites, but so that they were not immediately to touch these holy things on pain of death, on which account Aaron and his sons (the high-priests and priests) were first to wrap them carefully in coverings. But this prescript was strictly in force only for the transport in the wilderness, and Solomon applies it accord-

[1] The parallel account in 2 Chr. v. 2—7, 10, has, besides smaller alterations mostly intended for explanation in words and construction, only towards the close some greater deviations, omissions, and additions, but elsewhere it agrees almost word for word with our narrative.

ing to its spirit, so that the ark, as the most holy piece of furniture, is borne by the priests themselves, while the remaining articles, which were replaced by new ones in the temple, and were thus no longer to be used for the proper service of God, are brought in by the Levites, in order to remain as holy relics in the upper and side chambers.[1] The אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, which is brought into the temple (v. 4), is the Mosaic tent of assembly, the so-called tabernacle, which formerly stood at Gibeon (comp. iii. 4; 2 Chr. i. 3; 1 Chr. xvi. 39, xxi. 29), but before the dedication of the temple had been removed thence to Jerusalem, as Cler. not improbably conjectures, and not the tent erected for the ark on Zion (2 Sam. vi. 17; 1 Chr. xv. 1), as this is demonstrably nowhere called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד and in 2 Chr. i. 3, 4, is expressly distinguished from it. Even in 1 Chr. xxiii. 32, the only passage, where this can be a question, אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד denotes only the Mosaic tabernacle, as appears at once from the adjacent בֵּית יְהוָֹה.

V. 8. "They prolonged the staves, and the heads of the staves were seen from the holy place before the oracle, but they were not seen without," that is, they drew the staves, after the ark was set down in the most holy place, so far forward, that their ends could be observed from the sanctuary by the elevations on the vail, which might be seen in the sanctuary itself, but not without. The object of this cannot be determined with certainty. Some Rabbins were of opinion, that by this means the high-priest on the great day of atonement were enabled to enter between the staves directly before the ark.[2]

V. 9. The statement, that there was nothing in the ark save

[1] The Rabbins indeed, and ancient as well as modern theologians, assert that the Mosaic candlestick and shew-bread table were still used in Solomon's temple, but this assumption is not only destitute of all evidence, but contradicted by the fact, that Solomon had ten candlesticks and ten tables made. In v. 4 also it is only said of the tabernacle and the other articles וַיַּעֲלוּ they brought them in (to the temple), but of the ark it is farther remarked, the priests brought it into the holy of holies into its place under the expanded wings of the cherubim that were there (v. 6.)

[2] There is no probability in the opinion expressed by Kimchi, J. D. Michaelis and others, that new longer staves were made, as the old

the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb, has been arbitrarily explained in various ways by the old interpreters, in order to bring it into agreement with Heb. ix. 4, according to which, beside the two tables, there were to be found in the ark the golden pot with manna, and the blossoming rod of Aaron. Some, for example Vatabl., following *R. Levi ben Gersom*, explained אֵין רַק, *nihil aliud ex tota lege scilicet, sive ex libro legis continebatur in arca nisi etc.* Others, as Kanne, bibl. Untersuch. u. Auslegg. ii. p. 14 f., and the expositors there cited, thought, that these objects were only in the ark as long as it was moved from place to place, in order not to multiply the number of things to be removed, but were taken from it as soon as it obtained a fixed place. Others still imagine adjoining or side arks (*arcæ laterales*) of the ark of the covenant, in which these objects might be preserved, comp. Lundius jüd. Heiligth. p. 72 ff. or p. 78 ff., of the ed. of 1738, and the older expositors of the Epistle to the Hebrews.—All these hypothesis owe their origin to the false exposition of the passages, Ex. xvi. 33 f. and Num. xvii. 25 (comp. Bleek, d. Brief an die Hebr. ii. 2 p. 495 ff.) which we may conclude from Heb. ix. 2, had become traditional among the Jews. According to Ex. xvi. 33 the pot of manna was laid up לִפְנֵי יְהוָֹה before Jehovah, that is, according to the more exact terms of v. 34 לִפְנֵי הָעֵדוּת before the testimony, that is, before the ark containing the testimony or tables of the law, and therefore without the ark. The same place is assigned, Num. xvii. 25, for the blossoming rod of Aaron. From the beginning, therefore, nothing was in the ark but the two tables of stone. In modern times this verse has been misapplied by de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 164 ff.) to prove that the book of the law did not yet exist in Solomon's time, because it is neither found in the ark, nor, as might be expected from its importance, is its repository specially distinguished in the enumeration of the holy things brought into the new temple. But that it could not be in the ark is evident of itself, as it was to be deposited according to the express com-

Mosaic ones could have at most 10 cubits length, that is, the length of the holy of holies in the tabernacle. הֶאֱרִיךְ בַּדִּים does not mean to make new longer staves.

mand of Moses, Deut. xxxi. 26, not in the ark but at the side of the ark, comp. Hertz i. p. q. p. 13. But we cannot understand why it might not be among the holy things brought into the temple, as the explanation of כְּלֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ, namely, articles of holy use, not of the sanctuary, given by de Wette, i. p. q., is untenable, comp. Hertz and Kanne i. p. q.; and from the mention of the tables of stone it does not follow that the book of the law must also have been mentioned.[1] For the narrative is by no means so particular, as de Wette affirms, and the tables of the law had a much greater importance than the book of the law, which was only a supplement to it, comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 640.[2]

Vv. 10, 11. As formerly, at the dedication of the tabernacle, the glory of the Lord in the veil of a cloud filled the sanctuary, so that Moses could not enter (Ex. xl. 34 f.), so it was now. When the priests had deposited the ark in its place and retired from the sanctuary, the cloud filled the temple so that they could not stand to minister before the cloud.—The repetition of the same fact is described in the same words. Thereby the Lord consecrated the temple to be the place of the revelation of his glory, and Israel now found here his God and King as oft as he approached into his presence. The old controversy, whether the cloud, that visible symbol of the Divine glory, was constantly or only at certain seasons visible, Hengstenb., Christol. iii. p. 521 ff., has correctly decided in favour of the latter view, comp. also J. H. Kurtz, das Mos. Opfer (Mitau. 1842) p. 291, Not.—The Lord was constantly present in the temple, but the visible sign of his presence was only exhibited at the dedication as a manifest proof that the name of the Lord had taken up his residence here, and afterwards only when the high priest, on the great annual day of atonement, entered into the holiest, until the time when

[1] Besides, we cannot really conceive, how de Wette still (see his Lehrb. d. Einleit. § 162 *a*, in the 5th ed.) can lay stress on the want of any mention of the book of the law, when he himself acknowledges references to the Pentateuch, not only in ii. 3, but also in v. 10 of our chap. and in other places (see Einl. § 162 *b*.)

[2] In order to explain the אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת, we must complete the conception לֻחוֹת הַבְּרִית from לֻחוֹת הָאֲבָנִים, comp. Deut. ix. 9, where both phrases immediately follow. This complement is so much the easier, as כרת alone is elsewhere used for making a covenant, 1 Sam. xx. 16, xxii. 8; 2 Chr. vii. 18.

the temple, having become, through the abominations of the people, a den of murderers (Jer. vii. 11), ceased to be the dwelling place of the Lord, where Ezekiel in spirit beholds how the glory of the Lord, sitting above the cherubim, raises itself out of the temple, and, retiring over the Mount of Olives, leaves the temple and Jerusalem (Ezek. xi. 20.) כְּבוֹד יְהוָֹה, is the glorious nature of God, as it reveals itself to man, therefore his gracious presence in Israel, which, during the period of the old covenant, was connected with the mercy seat of the ark overshadowed by the cherubim, for which reason the ark also was called כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל, the glory of Israel (1 Sam. iv. 21, 22; Ps. lxxviii. 61), and on the other hand is designated the throne and footstool of God (1 Chr. xxix. 2; Ps. xcix. 5, cxxxii. 7; Lam. ii. 1.)—To the question, why the priests could not stand to minister before the cloud, C. a Lap. answers: *tum ab reverentiam divinæ majestatis se ostendentis per nebulam, tam quia nebula hæc sensibilior offendebat oculos sacerdotum eorumque aciem obtundebat et hebetebat.* The first of these grounds is not sufficient, and a materialistic notion lies at the foundation of the second, as if the cloud had been a gross cloud of smoke. The proper ground we perceive from Lev. xvi. 2—13, where Aaron is commanded to enter with the holiest before the mercy-seat of the ark not at every time, but only once every year, and also then only with burning incense, that the cloud of incense might cover the mercy-seat over the testimony, "that he die not, for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat." Not veneration for the Divine majesty alone forbids delay in the presence of the Divine glory, not even a holy dread merely thrills through the priests, so that they draw back, (Kurtz i. p. q. p. 293); but the glory of the Lord, like to a consuming fire, (Ex. xxiv. 17; Deut. iv. 24, ix. 3; Heb. xii. 29) is that before which unholy man cannot exist, to which he cannot approach without being destroyed. Hence the high priest was obliged to prepare his entrance into the holiest by first enveloping with the smoke of burning incense, the symbol of the sin-covering power of prayer, (Rev. v. 8, viii. 3, 4; Jam. v. 15), the cloud, which embodied the glory of the Lord.[1]—In

[1] Too abstractly and in too little harmony with the symbol is the meaning of the arrangement: "that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not," thus ex-

Chr. we have here an addition concerning the playing and singing of the Levites during the procession, (2, v. 12—14.)

Vv. 12, 13. *Vidit Salomo templum a nube repleri, recordaturque quod Deus in nube apparere voluerit etiam in tentorio Mosis; hinc certo credidit, quod in hac nube etiam esset Deus, qui sicut olim tabernaculum, sic jam templum replere et in eo habitare vellet. Seb. Schm.* After Vatabl. de Wette incorrectly renders אָמַר, *has decreed;* still more incorrectly Fr. v. Meyer explains, *decrees, intends.* אָמַר *has said* refers—as Jarchi, C. a Lap., and others, have observed—to earlier expressions of God, whereby he had declared his dwelling in darkness and in the cloud; only we must not limit this to Lev. xvi. 2, "I will appear in the cloud," but refer at the same time to Ex. xix. 9, where the Lord says to Moses, "I am come to thee בְּעַב הֶעָנָן, that the people may hear my voice," but especially to Ex. xx, 21, according to which God appeared on Sinai, בָּעֲרָפֶל, and Deut. iv. 11, v. 19, according to which he appeared in עָנָן וַעֲרָפֶל. The appearance of God in the dark cloud contains at the same time the reason why the holiest was quite dark both in the tabernacle and the temple.—Fully convinced of the presence of God in the cloud filling the sanctuary, Solomon, (v. 13), addresses God as present: "I have built a house for thee to dwell in, a place for thee to abide for ever." עוֹלָמִים (comp. on עוֹלָם. Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 427 ff.), is not to be so understood, as if Solomon believed, that the temple built by him would stand for ever, but is explained on the one hand, from the opposition to the former dwelling of God in the tabernacle, which, from its very nature, could only be temporary, since a tent, as the tabernacle was, is not only a mutable and provisional, but even a very fragile dwelling, whereas a house of stone and cedar is built for durability, (comp. 2 Sam. vii. 6 and 7,) where this opposition is presented; on the other hand, from the promise given to David, 2 Sam. vii. 13—16: "thy seed after thee shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom *for ever;* I will be to him a father,

plained by Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 644; "prayer, grounded on the reconciling and guilt-covering grace of God, is the only means of escaping the destruction, which the law testifying against trangression brings on the sinner.

and my mercy shall not depart from him," etc.—If in fact God would not withdraw his grace from the seed of David, who should build him a house, but would establish his kingdom for ever, the gracious relation also of God to Israel, which, through the dwelling of God, was embodied in the temple, must be of perpetual continuance. And this relation was by its very nature perpetual, although the earthly form of it was transitory. But from the transience and mutability of the form, Solomon at this moment looks quite away. But that it was not entirely unknown to him, we may with tolerable certainty infer from his clear conceptions concerning the covenant relation of God to Israel, as they are expressed in the course of his observations.

Vv. 14—21. The preceding words Solomon had uttered with his face directed to the holy of holies: now he turns to the people in the court and blesses the whole congregation of Israel, who were standing.—עֹמֵד, *reverentiam Deo et regi exhibiturus. J. H. Mich.*—יְבָרֵךְ denotes the blessing, with which Solomon greeted the congregation and introduced the following expression of praise to God. He praises the Lord, that he has now actually fulfilled the promise made to his father, 2 Sam. vii. 6—16, since he has now ascended the throne of his father, and been able to execute the wish of his heart, to build a house for the name of Jehovah, and to prepare a place there for the ark (vv. 15—21.) When Solomon describes the temple as the place for the ark, he points it out as its heart and centre; this it was, inasmuch as the covenant, in consequence of which the Lord of heaven and earth condescended to dwell as God of Israel in the midst of this his chosen people, rested entirely upon his holy law, which was deposited in the ark. On this ground also the symbolic sign of his presence was connected with the ark, and the temple was only the dwelling place of the Lord, in so far as it was the place for the ark, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 525 f.

With v. 22 begins the second act of the solemnity of dedication, containing (*a*) the prayer, which Solomon offered up before the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the priests on a brazen platform erected for the special purpose, five cubits long and broad and three cubits high (2 Chr. vi. 13), kneeling (v. 54 comp. with 2 Chr. vi. 14), and with his hands stretched out to heaven, vv. 23—53; (*b*) the blessing, in which he sums up the prayer pre-

sented to the Lord and applies it to himself and the assembled congregation, vv. 54—61.—The text to this prayer is the law, especially the blessing and curse pronounced upon the people by Moses, Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.—Setting out from the blessing here promised, Solomon praises (vv. 23, 24) the Lord for its past fulfilment, after which follows the prayer for the averting of the curse alluded to, (vv. 25—53.)

Vv. 23, 24. By the bestowment of the promised blessing the Lord had hitherto proved himself the only and true God in heaven and on earth, who keeps covenant and mercy with his servants who walk before him with all their heart. With this acknowledgment of God (comp. 2 Sam. vii. 22, xxii. 32) begins the prayer, for from this arises the right confidence for the petition, which is certain of being heard, Matt. xxi. 22; Mark xi. 24; Jam. i. 6.—The words, "keeps covenant and grace," are a literal reminiscence from Deut. vii. 9, only instead of the following, "that love him, and keep His commandments," Solomon says, "his servants, who walk before him with all their heart." —V. 24. A necessary result of the covenant-faithfulness of God is the promise given to his servant David, 2 Sam. vii., of which Solomon has now lived to see the fulfilment commenced (2 Sam. vii. 12, 13.) כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה *as this day*, is an abbreviated comparison for, as it is this day, in which the fulfilment is realised. In this fulfilment is concentrated the whole blessing, which the Lord had promised his people by Moses, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 605. Now as Solomon had expressed his thoughts already in vv. 12—21 on the realization that had now ensued before the eyes of all the people by the entrance of the glory of the Lord into the temple, he here dwells no longer on this, but proceeds immediately to the petition for the averting of the remembered curse. A part of the effect of this curse, however, was taken away by the promise, that the Lord would chasten the seed of David, if he commit iniquity, with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men, but would not quite withdraw his grace from him (2 Sam. vii. 14 f.) For if the Lord wished to make David's house and kingdom perpetual (2 Sam. vii. 16), he could not completely reject and extirpate Israel, as was threatened to the despisers of the law, Deut. xxviii. 45, 51, 61. Solomon therefore holds by this promise, and prays, vv. 25 and 26, the Lord first, that he would still farther graciously fulfil his

promise to David, that there shall not fail one to sit on his throne (comp. on ii. 4) on this condition: "only if thy children take heed to their way, that they walk before me, as thou hast walked before me." This condition certainly is not found in 2 Sam. vii., but it follows of itself from the spirit of the covenant relation, and especially from Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., where a blessing is announced only to the observers of the law, while severe punishments are threatened to its transgressors; for which reason also David urged it on his son before his death (ii. 3, 4), and the Lord himself in his appearance at Gibeon (iii. 14), and afterwards during the building of the temple (v. 12) had added it to his promise.—Solomon then prays v. 27 ff., that the Lord may especially make the temple the place of the manifestation of his grace, from this earthly seat of his name only grant grace and forgive sin, that the threatened curse may never fall upon Israel.

V. 27. כִּי means not *vero, but, however, indeed,* but *for,* as *partic. ration.* The connexion of v. 26 with v. 28 has been rightly stated by Seb. Schm.: *Hanc tuam gratiam* (that is, the selection of David's family for the sovereignty, in which was included the selection of Jerusalem and the temple for the place of the manifestation of the Lord) *te rogo: Scio enim quod non necesse habeas sive Jerusalem sive templo hoc, cum tantus sis ut cœli cœlorum te non capiant, multo minus domus, ut omnino mera gratia sit, si in hoc templo habites ipsumque templum non tui gratia sed nostri sit ædificatum, ut nobis sit certum symbolum gratiæ et præsentiae tuæ. Pro hac gratia te oro et precor, ut respicias precationem servi tui etc.*—אַף כִּי now even, that this house should contain thee (Maurer.) By the sentence, the heavens and heaven of heavens, that is, the heaven in its most extended compass, cannot contain God, Solomon strikes down all rationalistic assertions, that the Israelites imagined Jehovah to be only a finite national god. The infinitude and supramundane exaltation of God cannot be more clearly and strongly expressed than it is in these words.[1] That, how-

[1] Our verse was employed by the old theologians for the refutation of Spinoza thus in the *Brevis explicatio vs.* 27. i. *Reg.* 8, *ex quo contra Bened. Spinosam, qui extensionem proprietatem divinam sive Deum esse rem extensam, in Ethica sua part.* ii. *propos.* ii. *statuit,* Dei immensitas *probatur. Præside Fr. Ernst Meis, Th. D., respondente Jo. Gottl. Schubarth. Silusiæ.* 1710. 4.

ever, Solomon was addicted to no abstract idealism is sufficiently apparent from this, that he unites this consciousness of the infinite exaltation of God with the firm belief of his real presence in the temple. The true God is not merely infinitely exalted above the world, has not only his throne in heaven (vv. 34, 36, 39; Ps. ii. 4, xi. 4, ciii. 19; Is. lxvi. 1; Am. ix. 6), he is also present on the earth (Deut. iv. 39), has chosen the temple for the dwelling place of his name in Israel, from which he hears the prayers of his people, comp. Tholuck, die Bergpred. (1833) p. 395 f. Solomon hereby opposes not the fancy, that God actually dwells in the temple, as J. D. Mich. thinks, but only the fancy, that he so dwells in the temple, as men dwell in a place, confined to the place, and not at the same time beyond and above it. A fancy that no doubt sometimes found admittance with the carnally-minded Israelites; but was uniformly resisted by the prophets, comp. Mic. iii. 11; Jer. vii. 4, and others. Only by the certain confidence, that God was really present in the temple, the following petitions of Solomon can be understood, especially the general petition, vv. 28—30, that God would take the temple under his special protection and hear every prayer directed to it.—תְּפִלָּה, תְּחִנָּה and רִנָּה are distinguished so, that תפלה is prayer in general, whether it be praise, petition, or thanks, תחנה entreaty or supplication, petition for grace and help, רנה praise, prayer as the joyful expression of praise and thanks. V. 29. "That thine eyes may be open towards this house" (אֶל does not stand for עַל) that is, *speciali quadam providentia in hanc domum directi* (Mich.), but not *ad eam defendendam et conservandam*, but to hear the prayer directed to it. V. 30. תִּשְׁמַע אֶל־מְקוֹם וגו׳ "hear thou to thy dwelling place, to heaven"—a pregnant expression for, hear the prayer which ascends or is sent to thy dwelling place, to heaven. The last words, "hear and forgive," are to be left in their generality and not to be limited by any complement. Forgiveness of sins can alone remove the curse, which transgression draws after it.

This general petition is v. 31 ff. specialized by the enumeration of a series of cases, in which Israel in prayer turns to his God in the temple. The first case refers to the oath to be sworn in the temple. If any things (goods or money) delivered to a

neighbour to keep have been lost or stolen, or a head of cattle entrusted to him have died or been driven away, or injured (Ex. xxii. 7—9), or if any one denied that which was found, or over-reached another in any of these ways (Lev. v. 21—25), he, whom the other suspected of theft, fraud, wilful damage or concealment, or by whom he believed himself to be overreached, might be sued at law to make oath of his integrity.[1] In these cases the law ordered not only restitution with the addition of a fifth part, but also a trespass offering to atone for the guilt incurred by false swearing. But as this punishment could only be inflicted, if the guilty party afterwards confessed his guilt, many false oaths as to these points might be sworn and remain unpunished by men. Solomon therefore prays, that the Lord would hear every oath of this kind, which should be sworn before the altar, and judge his servants to punish the guilty and justify the innocent.[2] The phrase תֵּת דַּרְכּוֹ בְּרֹאשׁוֹ to inflict on any one merited punishment, which often occurs in Ezekiel, for example ix. 10, xi. 21, xvi. 43, xvii. 19, xxii. 31, is formed after the juridical *terminus* שִׁלֵּם אֹתוֹ בְּרֹאשׁוֹ Lev. v. 24, and תֵּת לוֹ כְּצִדְקָתוֹ (comp. 2 Sam. xxii. 21—25; Ps. xviii. 21—25, vii. 9, xxxv. 24) after the kindred formulæ of the law, הֵשִׁיב, גָּמַל, שָׁפַט כְּצִדְקָתוֹ. The phrases הַרְשִׁיעַ רָשָׁע and הַצְדִּיק צַדִּיק are derived from Deut. xxv. 2. The construction תִּשְׁמַע הַשָּׁמַיִם here and vv. 34, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49, which in Chronicles is retained only in 2, vi. 27, and elsewhere uniformly explained in 'תש 'מן־הש, might perhaps be accounted for by the adverbial use of the accusative (comp. on vii. 40), but it is obviously more correct

[1] Jarchi erroneously refers to the oath, which the woman accused of adultery had to take, Num. v. 15.

[2] The mention of this case appears certainly to be at variance with our assumption, that these petitions arise from the threatenings of the law (Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii.) but this appearance is ungrounded. For Solomon in all probability has in view the command preceding the threatenings in Lev. xxvi. 2, "reverence my sanctuary, for I am the Lord," and prays with reference to this command, that the Lord would in all cases, where reverence for his sanctuary was boldly violated, as by a false oath sworn at the altar, step in with his judicial righteousness and prove himself to be the holy one in order that the reverence due to his sanctuary might be maintained among the people.

to derive it as אֶל־הַשָּׁמַיִם v. 30 from a pregnance of the expression.[1]

V. 33 ff. The following cases are all taken almost word for word from Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. Vv. 33 and 34. If Israel on account of his sins be given up by the Lord to his enemies, so that they smite him, and then turn to the Lord and pray to him in the temple, then let him hear his prayer, forgive him and restore him to the land of his fathers.—Here the old interpreters found a difficulty in this, how those smitten by the enemy, who are to return to their native land after forgiveness received and therefore were carried away by the enemy, could pray to the Lord in the temple before their return. Most expositors (Kimchi, Vatabl., Calm., and others), therefore, understand the words so that those remaining behind turn to the Lord in prayer; others, as Seb. Schm., refer the *verba* to the *captivi et reliqui in terra*, but the captives could neither come to the temple, before they were free, nor return to the land, before they were carried away. The supplying of a different subject from עַמְּךָ thy people Israel is arbitrary. The solution of the difficulty follows from the passages of the law, which were before the mind of Solomon, Lev. xxvi. 17, "ye shall be slain before your enemies, and they that hate you shall reign over you, and ye shall flee when none pursueth you," and Deut. xxviii. 25, "The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies; thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them." The punishment here threatened consisted not in the removal of the whole people into a foreign land, but only in the conquest and subjugation of Israel by foreign nations intruding into their country, so that the mass of the people remained in the country, and only the captives of war and the deserters were removed into foreign countries. Thus the smitten might turn to the Lord in his temple and receive forgiveness, that they might be delivered from the hand of the enemy, and the exiles and deserters might be restored to their native land.

V. 35, 36. If the Lord punish the land on account of its sins with drought and want of rain, Deut. xi. 17; comp. with Lev.

[1] The old opinions on this point, see in *Deylingi Observatt, ss. i. p.* 16.

xxvi. 19, let him forgive his people and send rain to the land, if they turn from their sins to him. כִּי תַעֲנֵם when thou humblest them (Ps. lv. 20), not, when thou hearest them (Chald., Abarb. and others.) Contrary to usage and grammar de Wette rendered כִּי תוֹרֵם, after thou hast pointed out them the good way: כִּי does not mean, *after that*, and the *fut.* cannot stand for the *praet.* כי תורם corresponds with כי תענם v. 35, and means, when thou teachest them the good way. The words contain the motive to pardon. When God teaches his people, and if they follow not his commands endeavours to bring them back by chastisement to the good way, he must pardon them, if acknowledging the punishment as a chastisement they pray to him.

Vv. 37—40. In v. 37 Solomon names the various plagues, famine, if God on account of the sins of his people make the earth as brass and iron, so that it yields no increase, Lev. xxvi. 19 f.; Deut. xxviii. 23; and the staff of bread is broken (Lev. xxvi. 26)—pestilence (Lev. xxvi. 25), blasting and jaundice or yellowness of the grain[1] (Deut. xxviii. 22); consuming locust (חָסִיל is a mere epithet of אַרְבֶּה formed after Deut. xxviii. 38, where the consumption חסל of the grain by the locusts is threatened); distress from enemies in the land of their gates, that is, their cities, in their own land (for which stand, Deut. xxviii. 52, "in all thy gates, in thy whole land"), as it is threatened in copious terms, Deut. xviii. 49—57, to the despisers of the law; finally, plagues and sicknesses of every kind, as they are to fall in terrible ways upon the transgressors according to Lev. xxvi. 16, and Deut. xxviii. 59—61—and then v. 28 comprehends all the rest in the words, every prayer, every supplication, that is made by any man, by all thy people Israel, when they know every man the plague of his own heart. נֶגַע לְבָבוֹ, explanatory of which stand 2 Chr. vi. 29 נִגְעוֹ וּמַכְאֹבוֹ, Vatabl. and C. a Lap. understand of *dolor animi, quem quisque sentit apud se;*

[1] The word יֵרָקוֹן in all places where it occurs in connection with שִׁדָּפוֹן—besides that above cited, 2 Chr. vi. 28; Am. iv. 9; Hag. ii. 17—signifies a disease of grain, which is produced in Arabia by a hot wind, and consists in the ears becoming yellow and bearing no pickles, comp. Forskal in Niebuhr's Beschreib. v. Arabien, pref. p. 46.

J. D. Mich., need of every kind, which I cannot here particularly name—correct in substance but not explaining the terms. נֶגַע לְבָב signifies Divine chastisements, which affect the heart, that is, sufferings, sicknesses, pains, evil, and misfortune, which the individual recognises as Divine chastisements.—In all these cases may God hear the prayer and give to every man according to all his ways, that is, all his conduct, as he knows the heart, "for thou alone knowest the heart of all the children of men," v. 39. As heart-searcher God is alone able to give to every one according to all his ways, and so to hear his prayer as it is good for him, Jer. xvii. 10.—The object of all hearing of prayer, that they should fear the Lord, so long as they live in the land (v. 40), is expressed is the same words, which are given in Deut. iv. 10 as the object of teaching the commandments of God.

Vv. 41—43. After the petition for the hearing of every prayer of the Israelites follows naturally the thought of the stranger, not an Israelite, who will come from a distant country on account of the name of God to pray to Jehovah in his temple. That such strangers will come Solomon presumes with confidence; Moses, Num. xv. 14—16, had already permitted the stranger sojourning in Israel to offer at the tabernacle, and the great name of the Lord, his strong hand and his out-stretched arm had become known in Moses' time to all surrounding nations (Ex. xv. 14, xviii. 1; Jos. v. 1), and the knowledge of the glorious deeds of God in and among Israel itself had penetrated as far as Mesopotamia to Balaam,[1] comp. Hengstenb. die Gesch. Bil. p. 14.—The words הַיָּד הַחֲזָקָה and הַזְּרוֹעַ הַנְּטוּיָה standing separately in Ex. xiii. 9, xxxii. 11, and vi. 6, and used quite synonymously in Deut. ix. 26 and 29, are connected together in Deut. as the standing expression for the wonderful doings of omnipotence, by which God redeemed his people from the bondage of Egypt (comp. Deut. iv. 34, v. 15, vii. 19, xi. 2, xxvi. 8.) And what is expressed, Deut. xxviii. 10, as the blessed consequence of Israel's walking in the commandments of God: "all people of the earth will see that the name of the Lord is named upon thee," this Solomon transfers to the temple as the fruit of

[1] Historical facts of this kind are not known of Solomon's temple, as the queen of Sheba came to Jerusalem not to pray in the temple, but to learn of the wisdom of Solomon.

hearing the prayer, which the heathen offer in it, that all nations will acknowledge the name of the Lord, to fear (reverence) him (which is the object of every hearing of prayer by God) and learn his real presence in the temple.—The phrase frequently occurring in Jeremiah נִקְרָא שֵׁם יְהוָה עַל פל׳ the name of the Lord is named on any one, on a house (comp. Jer. vii. 10, 11, 14, 30, xiv. 9, xv. 16, xxv. 29, &c.), the most recent expositors (see Hitzig, Maur., Umbr. on Jer.) explain falsely, he bears from me (Jehovah) the name: it signifies, God is in him, revealed in him, really present, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 231.

In vv. 44—53 Solomon finally entreats a hearing in the case when far from Jerusalem and the temple prayers are directed thither to the Lord. *First*, vv. 44 and 45, if Israel go to war by order of the Lord. D. Kimchi explains the words, in the way in which thou wilt send them, too specially of an express Divine command through a prophet or through the Urim and Thummim. They denote merely the war which is carried on for the good of the theocracy.—Every righteous war is a war of the Lord (1 Sam. xxv. 28), where Israel might pray, may the Lord do right. עָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּט to do right or judgment, always denotes the decision in favour of the righteous cause, comp. Deut. x. 18; Ps. ix. 5; and Hengstenb. Comm. on the passage. The direction of the eyes in prayer to the temple, according to Steudel, Vorles. ü. d. A. Test. p. 192, was to serve "as an indication, that a man worshipped the God, in honour of whom this temple was erected." Unsatisfactory; as the true ground lay in the belief of the real presence of God in the temple—a belief that was a vain imagination in the heathen with respect to their gods, whereas among the Israelites it rested on the fact related, v. 10, of the condescending grace of God.—*Next*, vv. 46—49, if Israel on account of his sins were to be delivered to his enemy and carried away into the enemy's land. In this petition Solomon refers to the threatening, Lev. xxvi. 33 and 44, but so that he does not confine his prayer merely to the captivity of the whole people predicted there and in Deut. xxviii. 48 ff. and 64 ff., comp. with xxx. 1—5, but extends it generally to every removal into the enemy's land. הֵשִׁיב אֶל לֵב, to take to heart,

consider, Deut. iv. 39, and without an object, to reflect, comp. the passage here alluded to, Deut. xxx. 1.—The confession of sin, which Solomon requires as the condition of being heard, חָטָאנוּ וְהֶעֱוִינוּ רָשָׁעְנוּ, the Jews appropriated word for word in the exile, (comp. Ps. cvi. 6; Dan. ix. 5), as the most exhaustive expression of the deepest consciousness of guilt and sin. The words contain a climax; חטא, to slide, *labi*, denotes sin in its negative aspect, as a deviation from the way of God; העוה, to act perversely, in its positive aspect, as a perversion of right, (Job. xxxviii. 27, comp. Hävern. on Dan. ix. 5); רשׁע, in Arab. رشع, *magna cupiditate et concupiscentia fuit*, in Syr. *perturbatus est animo* denotes sin as passion, which gives men no rest, comp. Isa. lvii. 11, and Hengstenb. Comm. on the Ps. i. p. 11, and thus properly expresses the internal character of ungodliness.

In vv. 51—53 Solomon concludes with motives, which ought to secure the hearing of his prayer on the part of God. Seb. Schm. justly remarked, that these reasons apply not merely to the last but to all the preceding petitions. "*Hæc quæ oravi pro me et pro populo meo, Tu Domine facies propterea, quia populus tuus est, pro quo oravi et ego rex eorum: ideo audies preces servi tui et populi tui. Nam vs. 52 facit mentionem sui ipsius et omnium casuum, in quibus invocaturi essent Dominum.*"—The reason, v. 51: "for they are thy people and thine inheritance, which thou hast brought out of Egypt from the midst of the furnace of iron," is taken word for word from Deut. iv. 20, and v. 52: "for thou hast separated them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance," from Lev. xx. 24 and 26, comp. with Ex. xix. 5.—In 2 Chr. vi. 40—42, the conclusion of the prayer is varied so that it closes with a call upon the Lord to cause safety and grace from the temple to preside over his people.

V. 54—61. At the end of his prayer Solomon arose from his knees and blessed the whole congregation. This blessing is wanting in Chronicles, because it is only a recapitulation of the foregoing longer prayer.—V. 56 corresponds to vv. 23 and 24. The first half of the verse rests on the promise, Deut. xii. 9, 10, and its fulfilment, Jos. xxi. 44, 45 and xxiii. 14; the second on Lev. xxvi. 3—13, and Deut. xxviii. 1—14, where the "good

word" is specified in the blessing which the Lord had promised to his people and hitherto continually, but now in the most glorious manner fulfilled, comp. the remarks on v. 14, and Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 605. This glorious fulfilment authorised the confident hope, that the Lord would also hereafter fulfil that which he had promised to his servant David, "for a great while to come," (2 Sam. vii. 19), if only the people on their part kept the condition, on which alone the fulfilment could take place. Solomon then embraces, in vv. 57—61, the petitions of vv. 25—43, in the words: "the Lord be with us, as he was with our fathers —that he may incline our hearts unto him, to walk in all his ways, etc." lest the evil word, prophesied by Moses, Lev. xxiv. 14 ff.; Deut. xxviii. 15 ff., may befal on us.—On v. 57 comp. Deut. xxxi. 6, 8; Jos. i. 5.—אַל־יִטְּשֵׁנוּ corresponds to לֹא יַרְפְּךָ in three passages. In the Pentateuch נטשׁ is used only once of men, who forsake the Lord, Deut. xxxii. 15; otherwise it means, to throw down, scatter, Num. xi. 31, to cause something to lie, rest, Ex. xxiii. 11, to permit, allow, Gen. xxxi. 28. Of God forsaking his own, we find it used first, Ps. xxvii. 9, in connexion with עזב, as here and often in Jeremiah.—V. 61. Let your heart be שָׁלֵם עִם יְהוָה entirely, undividedly given to the Lord, so that it may have שָׁלוֹם in him alone, comp. xi. 4, xv. 3—14 etc.

With v. 62 begins the third act, the offering, consisting of a burnt-offering (עֹלָה), with the meat-offering (מִנְחָה) belonging to it, and a thank-offering (זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים), which Solomon and all the people offered.[1]—The thank-offering, which embodied

[1] Chronicles (2, vii. 12) here furnishes an important supplement in the statement, that fire from heaven consumed the offering. That this notice, which even Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 195 and 264), according to his false view of the sources of Chronicles, regards as a traditional appendix, does not, in consequence of its absence from our narrative, become an invention of the compiler of Chronicles, arising from a love of the miraculous, as de Wette and Gramberg imagine, has been already proved in my apolog. Vers. p. 329. The omission of this miraculous fact is explained, as so many other things that are passed over in the description of the temple, by this, that it is presumed to be known from the dedication of the tabernacle. As in the latter God the Lord does not rest satisfied with merely manifesting his presence by the cloud filling the holiest, but also consumed the first offering presented on the altar standing before it by fire from heaven (Lev. ix.

their thanks for the grace and covenant-faithfulness of God and represented their communion, their house and table companionship with the Lord (comp. Bähr, Symb. ii. p. 368 ff., and Kurtz, d. Mos. Opfer. p. 129 ff.), consisted, in correspondence with the greatness of the manifestations of the Divine grace, of 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep. This is so enormous a number of victims, that, as in the thank-offerings, only the fat pieces (חֶלְבֵי הַשְּׁלָמִים) were burned upon the altar, while the rest of the flesh was reserved for the sacrificial repast.—J. D. Mich. enters into a tedious reckoning of probabilities, whether the Israelites assembled in Jerusalem could have consumed 22,000 oxen in fourteen days, wherein however he altogether forgets the 120,000 sheep offered at the same time, and then, without any authority from the text, divides these offerings among fourteen days, though they were offered, according to v. 63, only at the dedication of the temple, which lasted but seven days. The seven days' feast of tabernacles certainly followed immediately after, but this is plainly distinguished from the dedication of the temple by the express division of seven days and seven days (v. 65.) The whole calculation, indeed, is vitiated, because Mich., according to his altogether external mode of examination, calculates the number of the offerings merely from an economical point of view. If Solomon and all the people offered thanks to the Lord for the favour of the building of the temple being happily completed, and now also consecrated by the miraculous manifestation of God, it would occur to no Israelite to calculate economically, whether he could, with his family, consume altogether the thank-offerings presented by him. The probability of the number mentioned can only be estimated from the greatness of the multitude possibly assembled at the dedication of the temple.—If, beside the elders, heads of families and tribes, all Israel, from the region of Hamath to the river of Egypt, in great assembly, (קָהָל גָּדוֹל, v. 75) appeared at this festival, there may have easily been 100,000 fathers, and 20,000 elders, heads of families, and tribes,

24), in order to sanction the altar as the legitimate place of offering; so with the repetition of the first miraculous fact in the dedication of the temple, the second also is so connected, that our author might deem it superfluous to mention it expressly.

assembled. Now if, on an average, every father offered only one sheep, every elder an ox, and the king out of his abundance, 2000 oxen and 2000 sheep, the number of victims stated will not appear too great. Now, whether a man could consume all the flesh of these offerings at the festival or not, is a matter of no consequence, as the law in this case commanded the burning of the remainder (Lev. vii. 17 ; xix. 6.)—That, besides, the number of the victims offered must have been unusually great, is evident from this, that the by no means small altar of burnt-offering was not sufficient to contain the sacrifices, and the king therefore dedicated the whole space of the inner court for a place of offering on this occasion (v. 64.)—"From the region of Hamath to the river of Egypt" denotes the territory of Israel, according to its whole extent from north to south, 2 Chr. vii. 8. The description of the north boundary, לְבוֹא חֲמָת (Num. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 8; Jos. xiii. 5; Judg. iii. 3; 1 Chr. xiii. 5; 2 Ki. xiv. 25; Am. vi. 14) is falsely explained by Gesen. (Lehrgeb. p. 799, *thes.* i. 185), Ewald (Krit. Gram. p. 646), Studer on Judg. iii. 3, and others, *unto Hamath*, so that Hamath was the border city, and לְבוֹא is pleonastic, in decided opposition to which is the circumstance, that wherever a place is to be described as a proper boundary point, the simple עַד or מִן merely is used, for example, Gen. x. 19; Jos. xiii. 3—9, etc.—לְבוֹא and בֹּאֲךָ denote the region from a place.—עַד בֹּאֲךָ, till one comes, that is, towards, בְּבוֹא in the direction of—עַד לְבוֹא, towards, מִלְּבֹא from the direction of, that is, from the region of—so that the place (city) named after this particle always lies beyond the boundary point, the boundary reaches only to its neighbourhood. חֲמָת is 'Ἐπιφάνεια of the Greeks, on the Orontes, between Larissa and Arethusa, still an important town of about 30,000 inhabitants under the old name حماة, comp. Burkh. Reise, i. p. 249 ff., and Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 537. It did not belong to the kingdom of Israel, although Solomon, according to 2 Chr. viii. 4, possessed a part of the territory of Hamath.[1]

[1] V.Raumer (Palæst. p. 126) erroneously confounds חַמַּת Hammath (*thermæ*, the fortified city of Naphtali) with the Syrian Hamath, and understands of the former all the above cited passages, where Hamath is named as the north boundary of Palestine.

The river of Egypt is not the Nile, but the brook which falls into the Mediterranean Sea at the town of Rhinocorura, or Rhinocolura, now el Arish, and formed the south boundary of the land of Israel, Num. xxxiv. 5; Jos. xv. 4, 47. Comp. Rosenm. Hdb. d. bibl. Altherthk. ii. 1, p. 86 ff., and Gesen. *thes*. ii. 872.

V. 66. On the eighth day of the last named seven days' feast of tabernacles, that is, on the twenty-third day of the seventh month (2 Chr. vii. 10) Solomon dismissed the people, who returned to their tents joyful and glad of heart, for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David his servant and Israel his people.—Tents for houses (Judg. vii. 9; 2 Sam. xx. 1) is an expression retained from the life of the patriarchs. David his servant, not Solomon, is named, because all the happiness conferred upon the people under Solomon was only the fruit of the promise made to David, comp. at v. 15.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

THE HAPPY ANSWER TO SOLOMON'S PRAYER, VV. 1—9; CLOSING NOTICES OF HIS BUILDINGS, VV. 10—25; AND OF HIS NAVY, VV. 26—28.

Vv. 1—9. The second appearance, which was made to Solomon, seems according to v. 1 to have taken place at least thirteen years after the dedication of the temple, *post quam rex aedificiis suis omnibus supremam manum imposuisset* (Sanctius.) But this is inconceivable, as this manifestation contains the special answer to the prayer uttered by Solomon at the dedication. *Seb. Schmidt* indeed thinks: *quod Deus distulerit hanc apparitionem usque ad tempus, quo Salomonis peccatum appropinquabat, ut non diu antequam fieret, eum serio moneret.* But who could believe, that the Lord, if he had first appeared to him so late, would have begun his answer with the words: "I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication that thou hast made before me; I have hallowed this house which thou hast built, etc.?" The old interpreters, therefore, held that this appearance took place the night

after the dedication of the temple. But are we to assume this in contradiction to the plain words of the text? By no means. V. 1, indeed, forms the transition from the prayer of Solomon to the answer of God, for which reason it is, 2 Chr. vii. 11, the closing formula to the section on the dedication of the temple; but our author has made this transition sentence at the same time the superscription of the following section in which he records not only the appearance of God but also that which Solomon undertook for the completion of all his buildings. This superscription, however, is couched in such a manner, that it forms at the same time the introduction to the Divine appearance, and is therefore, after this has been communicated, partly repeated in v. 10 as introductory to that which took place after the twenty years, in which Solomon had executed the building of the temple and his palace. The error, that the Divine answer to the prayer of Solomon followed twenty years after, arose merely from misunderstanding this general determination of the first verse. The time of the Divine appearance accordingly is not definitely stated in our narrative, but it may be determined with tolerable certainty from the words: "the second time, as he had appeared unto him at Gibeon" (v. 2.) As God appeared to Solomon at Gibeon in the night following his sacrifice, so also here probably in the night (2 Chr. vii. 12) after the prayer of dedication and the sacrifice.—The Divine promise to hear his prayer adheres closely in its terms to the prayer of Solomon (v. 3); our narrative gives only a summary, while it is more fully stated 2 Chr. vii. 12—16. If Solomon prayed: "that thine eyes may be open toward this house," the Lord answers, ever giving more than we ask, "mine eyes and my heart shall be there."—Vv. 4 and 5 contain the special answer to viii. 25 and 26.—V. 6—9 refer to the prayer that the curse may be averted, to which the Lord replies, if you and your children turn from me, keep not my commandments and worship other gods, this house will not protect you from the curses threatened in the law, but these will be fulfilled on you and on this temple in all their extent and rigour. This threatening adheres most minutely in form of expression to the Pentateuch, with v. 7 comp. Deut. xxviii. 37, 45, 63.—In vv. 8 and 9 is the curse pronounced upon Israel, Deut. xxix. 22, 24—26 transferred to the temple. The

words, "this house will be high," for which stand in 2 Chr. vii. 21, "this house, which was high," have been variously misunderstood. The assumption of Seb. Schmidt, that the *fut.* stands for the *præt.* and אֲשֶׁר is to be supplied, is as objectionable as the proposal of Cler. and Dathe to amend the text of our author from Chronicles, as is actually done in *Cod.* 66 in Kennicott. The correctness of our text is proved by the old versions. LXX. render literally, ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ἔσται ὁ ὑψηλός; the *Vulg.* explains: *domus hæc erit in exemplum;* the Syr. and Arab. "this house will be destroyed," while the Chald. "this house, which was high, will be destroyed, has explained it according to 2 Chr. vii. 21, but so as to show that it had our text before it.[1] The sense is, this house will remain high, that is, be a conspicuous example of punishment. The temple was situated on a high hill, and if it be destroyed, this example of Divine punishment will meet the eyes of every passer by (J. D. Mich.) There is probably in עֶלְיוֹן an allusion to Deut. xxvi. 19 and xxviii. 1. Here God promises to make Israel high (עֶלְיוֹן) above all nations. This blessing is to be changed into a curse; the temple, which was high and far-famed, is to be and remain high but in an opposite sense.[2]

Vv. 10—24. In this section the Shemitic mode of composing history, by collecting excerpts from antecedent documents, is presented in a very clear light. Here unquestionably all is to

[1] Inadmissible are also all explanations, which have recourse to ellipses, as that of Jarchi: *erit excelsa omni sc. tempore quo non peccaveritis, ast quando peccabitis, omnis qui transibit etc.*—of Vatabl. and others.

[2] The deviating text of Chronicles leads to the assumption of such a play on words. For to derive this deviation from a misunderstanding of our text can satisfy no sensible critic; still less can it be an explanatory paraphrase for obviating all possible misunderstanding; for had the writer wished to explain, he would certainly have explained as the Chald., Syr., Arab., and *Vulg.* have done. J. D. Mich. was on the track of the correct explanation of this deviation, when he remarked that the original text had been, "This temple, which has been so conspicuous, will be a conspicuous example of punishment;" only he is mistaken when he adds, that something has fallen out of both texts. Rather the complete text stood from the beginning neither in our verse nor in Chronicles, but in the larger source employed by both, from which each in his own way made an imperfect excerpt.

be put together, which was yet to be related concerning Solomon's buildings, especially the fortification of a great number of cities in his wide dominions and every thing connected with this; but this statement is not only very incomplete, but appears also at first view quite unarranged. Only on a thorough examination into the matter a principle of arrangement is here also discovered. Our author, to wit, arranges his materials according to the means which enabled Solomon to execute so many works.[1] These means were *(a)* the supply of building materials on the part of Hiram, *(b)* the socagers, whom he levied from his territories. But in the description of these means is inserted the account of the cities built and fortified, and the supply on the part of Hiram is only parenthetically (v. 11) introduced, because it had been already (v.) related, and even the account of the cities which Solomon wished to present to Hiram, is imperfectly given. Considered as a section in themselves, vv. 10—14 want a conclusion; for v. 14, which, as it furnishes a supplementary explanation to v. 11, necessarily belongs to it, has not the form of a conclusion. More must therefore have been found in the source from which these notices are taken. Now Chronicles comes in to supply the statement, that Hiram gave cities to Solomon, which the latter built and caused Israelites to dwell in them (2 Chr. viii. 1, 2), that is, the cities given to him as a present by Solomon, because they did not please him, he returned them, on which Solomon built them and peopled them with Israelites.[2] This places the connexion of our section with the buildings of Solomon in a much clearer light.

Vv. 10—13. With regard to the construction of vv. 10 and 11, the first half of v. 11 is to be taken as a parenthesis, as the conclusion to וַיְהִי, v. 10, begins with אָז יִתֵּן. The statement, that Solomon (contrary to the Mosaic law) should have given a

[1] In Chronicles the arrangement is simple, as in the first place the buildings are enumerated (2, viii. 1—6), and then an account is given of the socagers.

[2] That the brief account of Chronicles (2, viii. 2), "And the cities which Hiram had given to Solomon, Solomon built them, and caused the children of Israel to dwell there," is to be reconciled with our narrative in the above-mentioned way, has been observed among others by the ingenious Geographer C. Ritter, die Erdkunde ii. p. 384, see my apolog. Vers. p. 221 f.

part of the land bestowed by Jehovah on the people of Israel to the heathen king Hiram, has been the cause of much scruple to the old interpreters, so that *Serarius*, *C. a Lap.*, and others assumed, that he had merely resigned to him the use of it, until he should be able to refund the expenses incurred for him. But nothing of this is in the text. Grotius, on the contrary, affirms the opinion, that they were cities conquered in war, of which the king had the free disposal. But this also is an unfounded conjecture by which that scruple derived from the law (Lev. xxv. 13 ff.) is not at all set aside. For if these cities lay within the boundaries assigned to the Israelites by Moses, they were still according to the law inalienable, even if the Israelites were unable to conquer or keep them, until David, who waged many successful wars against the Syrians, annexed them to the territory of Israel. The bestowment of these cities on Hiram can only be reconciled with Solomon's theocratic feeling by the supposition, that they were inhabited not by Israelites but by heathen. But this is not only evident from this, that Solomon first peopled them with Israelites, after he had built them (2 Chr. viii. 2), but is rendered probable from other considerations. The cities were in the land of הַגָּלִיל. Galil denotes, not indeed the whole extent of the later province of Galilee, but yet a part, and that the northern part of it, as appears from this, that the Kadesh belonging to the tribe of Naphtali (Jos. xx. 7, 21, 32; 1 Chr. vi. 61) is distinguished by the addition בַּגָּלִיל from the Kadesh in the south of Palestine. The passages 2 Ki. xv. 29 and Is. viii. 23 show still more clearly, that Galil included in it the northern part of the tribe of Naphtali (comp. Gesen. and Hitzig on Is. viii. 23), and the designation of this Galil as גְּלִיל הַגּוֹיִם by Isaiah, proves at the same time that this district was mostly inhabited by the heathen. Probably the Israelites had partly not quite conquered it, partly very soon lost it again, although it was assigned to the tribe of Naphtali. For here lay for example Hazor, the residence of the Canaanitish king Jabin, that was certainly taken and burned (Jos. xi. 10—13), but yet in the early times of the period of the Judges was again in the possession of a king Jabin, whose general Sisera dwelt in the neighbouring Harosheth of the *Gentiles* (Judg. iv. 2, 13.)—The

cities of this district were probably in a very unfavourable condition, on which account they did not please Hiram, so that he called them contemptuously the land of Cabul. Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 656) concludes on good grounds from the connexion of our passage, that Cabul is a name of contempt.[1] But his explanation is doubtful. Among the different opinions enumerated by Gesen. *l.c.* the explanation proposed by Hiller in the *Onomast. V. T. p.* 435 and adopted by Reland, Gesen., and Maurer, namely, that it is contracted from כְּהֲבּוּל *sicut id quod evanuit tanquam nihil,* has still the greatest probability, whereas other explanations attempted from the *rad.* כָּבַל *vinxit, constrinxit,* for example that of Cocceius, a land which fettered its inhabitants as slaves through hard labour, or that current among the Rabbins, a miry or clayey land in which the foot sinks and is held fast (comp. Rashi *ad h. l.* and Fürst, *Concord. p.* 541), are much too artificial and far-fetched, and that of the Rabbins can scarcely be reconciled with the natural character of this region, as the soil here is particularly mountainous and hilly, and towards Safed of a volcanic nature (comp. Robins. Pal. iii. p. 637 ff.), but swampy land is only found about the sea of Merom.

V. 14. The statement here appended, as already remarked, by way of supplement for the explanation of וּבַזָּהָב, namely, that Hiram gave Solomon 120 talents of gold, must appear very surprising, if we consider Solomon's great wealth and his large annual income in gold. J. D. Mich. therefore not improbably conjectures, that this gold was not raw but wrought. If we do not assume this, we shall be compelled to suppose, that Hiram presented this inconsiderable sum compared with Solomon's wealth in gold for some special purpose.

V. 15 ff. The other means, by which Solomon was enabled to raise so many buildings, consisted in this, that he levied the remnant of the old Canaanitish population still dwelling in his territory for socagers. זֶה דְבַר־הַמַּס is thus connected with the

[1] A place Cabul occurs indeed, Jos. xix. 27, on the borders of Asher. But as its situation cannot be determined with certainty, nothing can be gathered from it for the explanation of this passage, even though it should be identified with the town of this name mentioned by Edrisi and belonging to the eparchy of Safed (comp. *Rosenmülleri Anal. arab. iii. p.* 41.)

socagers. But before this connection itself is stated, the author enumerates the buildings, vv. 15—19.—הַמִּלּוֹא the entrenchment, the castle (comp. Gesen. *thes. ii.* 789), which David already built (2 Sam. v. 9) and which was situated, according to this passage and 1 Chr. xi. 8, on Mount Zion, and according to xi. 27, 2 Chr. xxxii. 5, on the wall enclosing Zion. We know nothing farther of it, comp. Lightfoot *Opp.* ii. p. 189 and Hamelsv. bibl. Geogr. ii. p. 46 f.—*The walls of Jerusalem.* David also appears to have built at these (2 Sam. v. 9; 1 Chr. xi. 8.) According to xi. 27, Solomon closed the breaches of the city of David; the building of Solomon therefore consisted either in the repair of the walls surrounding Zion, or, as in our verse the walls of Jerusalem, not of the city of David merely, are named, in building at the same time a fortified wall round the lower city, and either, as Hamelsv. i. p. q. p. 50 supposes, enclosing the temple-mount within the city wall, or at least joining the fortified temple-mount to the wall of the upper city. חָצֹר Hazor, an old Canaanitish royal city, not far from Kadesh, situated according to Josephus above the sea of Merom, and attached to the tribe of Naphtali, comp. Rosenm. bibl. Alterthk. ii. 2, p. 55, and v. Raumer Pal. p. 126. It belonged evidently to the twenty cities, which Solomon wished to cede to Hiram, and was, on account of the importance of its situation on the northern boundary of Palestine, fortified by Solomon. This also explains why it is not expressly mentioned in the parallel passage of Chronicles, because it was already included under the cities not accepted by Hiram and then built by Solomon.—Concerning Megiddo comp. iv. 12.—גָּזֶר Γαζέρ or Γαζηρά, an old Canaanitish royal city on the western border of Ephraim, assigned to the Levites, but possessed by the Canaanites, until Pharaoh took and burned it, slew its inhabitants and then gave the city as a dowry to his daughter who was married to Solomon, on which Solomon rebuilt and probably fortified it, comp. Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 194 f. Its site has not yet been discovered, but it cannot, as v. Raumer, Pal. p. 188 f. conjectures, have been situated near Joppa on the way from Joppa to Ramleh, but must be sought for between Beth-horon and Lydda, north of the straight way between these two places, as it lay, according to Eusebius, four Roman miles

north of Nicopolis.—V. 17. Beth-horon the lower or nether. According to 2 Chr. viii. 5 Solomon also fortified upper Beth-horon. Both places exist at the present day under the somewhat corrupted names of Beit Ur et Tahta and el Foka, with remains of the old walls and foundations stones, and lie scarcely an hour asunder on the way from Joppa to Gibeon and Jerusalem, only five hours or twelve Roman miles from the latter, at the foot of the mountain, nether Beth-horon westward on a small eminence, upper Beth-horon eastward on a steep projection of the mountain only to be ascended by steps, comp. Robins. Pal. iii. p. 273 ff. By this position they formed when fortified a strong banner against every enemy marching from Joppa to Jerusalem.

V. 18. בַּעֲלָת Baalath is identified by Iken (*dissert. phil. theol.* i. p. 249), Michaelis (*Suppl. ad lex. Hebr.* i. p. 199), and Rosenm. (bibl. Althk. i. 2 p. 281) with Baalgad or Heliopolis in in Coelesyria, that is, Baalbek, of which there are still splendid ruins, but without sufficient grounds. For that the present inhabitants of this region ascribe the building of the city to Solomon, proves nothing from the entirely unhistorical character of such legends, and the mention of Baalath in this verse before Tadmor is counterbalanced by 2 Chr. viii. 6, where it is entirely separated from Tadmor. According to Jos. xix. 41—44, comp. with xv. 10, Baalath or Baalah, which is there distinguished from Baalgad (Jos. xi. 17, xii. 7, xiii. 5), lay on the borders of Judah and Dan, west of Ekron, and belonged to Dan (comp. Robins. Pal. iii. p. 226 not. 5), in accordance with which Josephus testifies (*Antiq.* viii. 6, 1), that it was not far from Beth-horon and Gezer.—תמר according to the Kethibh, that is, Palm, city of palms, in 2 Chr. ix. 4 תַּדְמֹר, called by the Arabs of the present day تَدْمُر or تَتْمُر *locus palmarum ferax*—is Palmyra of the Greeks and Romans, situated between Damascus and the Euphrates in a fruitful region enclosing it around from the sandy desert (therefore Tadmor in the wilderness), the ruins of which, particularly of an enormous temple of the sun, which outshine in architectural beauty, art, and magnitude all the antiquities of Greece and Italy, have been extant from the times of Diocletian, and were first copied and described by R. Wood, The Ruins of

Palmyra, Lond. 1753, on which the present Tadmor, a cluster of farm-houses, is built, comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2 p. 275. —According to Arabic legends (comp. *Schultens ind. geogr.* to the *vita Saladini* under *Tadmor*), the city existed before Solomon, and was therefore only rebuilt, embellished, and perhaps fortified by him as a barrier against the conquerors of Upper Asia. בָּאָרֶץ after בַּמִּדְבָּר creates a great difficulty. What is the meaning of Tadmor in the wilderness in the land? J. D. Mich. therefore conjectured, that the name of the land, in which Palmyra lay, might have fallen out, and Cler. supplied *Aramæa.* Against this, however, stands the consideration, that all the old translators had our present text before them, and endeavoured by possibility to explain it. The most probable opinion is that proposed by *Tremellius*, that by בָּאָרֶץ the cities before mentioned are designated as situated *in regno Salomonis et intra fines a Deo designatos.* We obtain this meaning by connecting בארץ with וַיִּבֶן v. 17; he built them in the land, that is, in his own land, and thus it forms a parallel to בְּכֹל אֶרֶץ מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ v. 19.[1]

[1] Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 210) explains בָּאָרֶץ in a peculiar manner. Setting out with the assumption, that תמר is not Palmyra, but Hazezon-Tamar or En-gedi, which is named תָּמָר in Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28, and that תַּדְמֹר (Chron.) signifies the same city En-gedi, he finds the proof of this opinion in בארץ, since Tamar is distinguished by this addition as a city lying in the land, that is, inland, from the Syrian Tadmor or Palmyra. But there is no ground for this proof. For in the first place it is not decided, that תָּמָר in Ezek. is certainly En-gedi, since others understand by it either Jericho or Tamar, a military post mentioned by Eusebius not far from the south point of the Dead Sea (comp. Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 738); and the assertion of Movers, that En-gedi is called also Tadmor by the Talmudists, is destitute of all ground, as the Rabbinical passages cited by him in *Lightf. Chorogr. Matth. præm. c.*vi., neither assert nor by any means imply this. Finally the Tadmor built by Solomon, according to 2 Chr. viii. 3, 4, lay in the region of Hamath Zobah. And even if with Movers, p. 209, we were to charge the writer with error, yet by בַּמִּדְבָּר בָּאָרֶץ Tadmor cannot possibly be distinguished as a city situated in the wilderness of Judah on the Dead Sea in opposition to the Syrian Tadmor, because Solomon, according to Chronicles, not merely possessed a part of the territory of Zobah and Hamath, and

V. 19. Beside the cities named, Solomon built also עָרֵי מִסְכְּנוֹת magazine-cities, fortresses, in which were deposited provisions for the army (2 Chr. xvii. 12, xxxii. 28), as Pharaoh built in Goshen by means of the Israelites (Ex. i. 11, and Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. and Asg. p. 45 f.), and עָרֵי הָרֶכֶב cities for the war-chariots and horses, comp. v. 6. The latter are perhaps identical in part with the magazine-cities, and several of them might have been situated on the northern boundary of his kingdom in the region of Hamath, and on Lebanon, as must be inferred partly from the importance of the north border for the security of the whole kingdom, partly from the fact that Solomon had an adversary in Rezon of Damascus (xi. 23), who might easily excite to rebellion the northern provinces which were first incorporated into the kingdom by David, and partly from the express statement of 2 Chr. xvi. 4, according to which there were magazine-cities in the land of Naphtali.

Vv. 20—23. Comp. v. 27—30 עֲבָדִים v. 22 servants of the kings. שָׂרִים are military and civil officers. שָׁלִישִׁים τριστάται royal satellites. According to etymology שָׁלִשׁ signifies the third either in rank or in some other respect. According to Gesen. *(lex. man.)* it denotes originally the chariot-warriors (three in each chariot), then the royal guards. This opinion approved also by Thenius on 2 Sam. xxiii. 8 is founded partly on the passages Ex. xiv. 7, and xv. 4, partly on the fact that the writers of *catenae*, as Origen testifies, thus explain the Greek τριστάτης, but the Glossator in the *Octateuch*. (see Schleussner *lex. in LXX. tom.* v. *p.* 338) explains τριστάτας by τοὺς παρὰ χεῖρα τοῦ βασιλέως ἀριστερὰν τρίτης μοίρας ἄρχοντας. Similarly *Hieron. ad Ezech.* 23: *nomen est secundi gradus post regiam dignitatem.* Comp. also Bochart, *Hieroz.* i. *p.* 172. By this the testimony of the author of the *catena* is completely neutralized, especially as it is at most only a probable inference from Ex. xiv. 5. For here it is said of the war-chariots of Pharaoh

established garrisons in it, but, according to 1 Ki. v. 4, his territory extended to Thapsacus on the Euphrates, and therefore the Syrian Tadmor or Palmyra in the wilderness actually lay in the land, that is, in the land under his sway, and, according to ix. 16, he erected buildings on Lebanon, and in all the land of his dominion.

שָׁלִשִׁם עַל כֻּלּוֹ, which Gesen. explains: chariot-warriors were upon each; but it may also mean, royal guards or satellites on each. The *Sing.* הַשָּׁלִישׁ denotes in all the places, where it occurs, the royal adjutant, comp. 2 Ki. vii. 2, 17, 19, and xv. 25 (Pekah, the Shalish of Pekahiah, who rebelled against him), where neither chariot-warriors nor charioteers (as de Wette everywhere renders the word) can be understood. In ix. 25 also שָׁלִישׁ is not chariot-warrior but adjutant of the king. The *plur.* שָׁלִישִׁים occurs 2 Ki. x. 25 in connection with הָרָצִים of the royal body-guards, and thus denotes royal satellites, as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 8; 1 Chr. xi. 11, and xii. 8. Chariot combatants cannot be intended here, because David employed no chariots in his wars, and preserved only a hundred even of the war-chariots taken from the Syrians, and consequently could have no corps of chariot-warriors. Finally also in Ezek. xxiii. 15 and 23, שָׁלִישִׁים denotes only a choice band of warriors. After all we must understand the word in Ex. xiv. 7, and xv. 4, also of the guard of Pharaoh, especially as the old Pharaohs had a guard (comp. Hengstenb. die BB. Mos. und Aeg. p. 132 f.), and their war chariots were very small and light, so that they could scarcely hold three men, comp. Rosellini in Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 131, and our remarks on v. 6.[1]

Vv. 24 and 25 contain two notices that appear to be appended in this place in quite a superfluous and arbitrary manner, but yet are inserted here not without plan and design. They stand namely in reference to iii. 1—4, and show how Solomon after the completion of his buildings remedied the defects which existed in the beginning of his reign, comp. the remarks on iii. 1. These verses thus form the full and suitable close to the section treating of Solomon's buildings.

Vv. 26—28. Solomon also built a fleet (אֳנִי fleet, not ship, comp. Gesen. *thes.* i. 124) at Ezion-geber beside Eloth, on the northern point of the Red Sea, and sent his servants with the skilful Tyrian mariners to Ophir, from which they brought

[1] Thenius (die BB. Sam. p. 247) explains our verse in a very modern and arbitrary manner, when he understands by עֲבָדִים lieutenants, שָׂרִים captains, שָׁלִישִׁים majors, and שָׂרֵי הָרֶכֶב and שָׂרֵי הַפָּרָשִׁים colonels.

yearly 420 or 450 talents of gold, and according to x. 11 sandal wood and precious stones. On this subject compare my "Untersuchung über die Hiram-Salomonische Schiffahrt, Dorpat, 1834," the first section of which on the navigation to Ophir is also printed in the Dorpater Beitr. zu d. theol. Wissensch. vol. ii. p. 233 ff. Here I have shown at large that Ophir is not to be sought in India or the east coast of Africa, but lay in the southern part of Arabia, with which view most learned men now agree, comp. Gesen. (*thes.* i. 141 sqq.), Winer (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 215 ff.), and Tuch in the review of my work (Hall. A. L. Z. 1835 No. 80), who especially has farther established the diversity of Ophir from the *Σουππάρα* of *Ptolem.* and *Ουππάρα* of Arrian.[1] Concerning Ezion-geber and Eloth comp. Robins. Pal. i. p. 275—284. Of Ezion-geber no trace is to be found. But Eloth continued as a city to the twelfth or fourteenth century; since Abulfeda's time, about 1300 A.D., there exists of it only a small fort with a governor, and a small Egyptian garrison under the new name of Akaba, and heaps of rubbish still mark the place where the city once stood.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### VISIT OF THE QUEEN OF SHEBA TO JERUSALEM, VV. 1—13. SOLOMON'S RICHES, VV. 14—29.

V. 1. Concerning the country of the queen of שְׁבָא not only the old expositors, but also two nations, the Arabs and the Ethiopians contend,[2] although here the name alone decides.

[1] Junker: "The circumnavigation of Lybia by the Phenicians about the year 610—604 B.C." in the supplem. to Jahn's New Jahrbb. für Philolog. 1841 Bd. 7. H. 3, has again briefly sought Ophir in India, but this opinion is rightly again rejected, and Ophir assumed to be in Arabia, by Herm Bobrik, "the development of geography among the ancients," in the Zeitschrift für vergleich. Erdkunde of Lüdde, year i. vol. ii. P. i. p. 381.

[2] According to the legends of the Abyssinians, which are adopted by Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 6, 5), *Corn. a Lap.*, *Capell.* (*Observ.* p. 648),

שְׁבָא in the Old Testament denotes, never Meroe or Ethiopia, which is called סְבָא, but always the kingdom of the Sabæans with their capital Saba or *Μαριάβα*, a country in Arabia Felix abounding in frankincense, gold, and precious stones, the inhabitants of which were celebrated among the Hebrews and Greeks for their extensive trade in these products. See the proofs in Bochart (*Phal. ii. c.* 26), Rosenm. (bibl. Althk. iii. 174 ff.), and Gesen. (thes. iii. p. 1350.)—The fame of Solomon's great wisdom, which might have been spread abroad, according to the probable conjecture of Ephraim Syrus, by the voyages to Ophir, moved this queen to come to Jerusalem in order to be convinced by proving him with riddles of the truth of the report that had come to her ears. The difficult words, לְשֵׁם יְהוָה, cannot mean, *in nomine Jehovæ*, still less, et *nomen Jeh.* (*Tremell.*), as לְ never stands for וְ, as *Nolde Conc. partic.* asserts, and the translation *καὶ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου* in LXX., Syr. and Arab. rests only on a peculiar view of the words, and does not, as Dathe thinks, presuppose the reading וְשֵׁם. The literal rendering of Seb. Schmidt; *quoad nomen Jehovæ* is allowable, but the explanation *quod Jehova ipsi dedisset tantam sapientiam* is an arbitrary *quid pro quo*. Even the view adapted by Maurer and de Wette: *in gloriam Jovæ*, that is, the fame ministering to the glory of God, is scarcely contained in the words.[1] I render: "by the name of

and Grotius, this queen had a son Menihelek by Solomon, from whom the Abyssinian monarchs believe themselves descended (comp. Ludolf *hist. Aethiop.* ii. 3, and *Lobo* voyage d'Abyssinie i. p. 337 ff.) But these legends are fully counterbalanced by similar traditions of the Arabs, who call this queen Balkis, and make her a wife of Solomon, comp. Koran. Sur. 27, and Pococke *Specim. hist. Arab.* p. 60; if such legends in general could prove anything in their obviously unhistorical character. The other arguments advanced in favour of the Ethiopians, Bochart (*Phal.* ii. c. 26) has overturned with a great profusion of learning.

[1] Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 75) wishes here also again to remove the difficulty by the assumption of a gloss, in accordance with a review in Rheinwald's Repert. viii. p. 199, against which, however, the old versions, which have universally read לְשֵׁם יְהוָה, enter a protest, if Movers' reasons actually deserved the name. For he says, *(a.)* "לְשֵׁם יְהוָה is superfluous, moreover, unsuitable and unintelligible," that is, simply because Movers did not understand it, it appears to him

the Lord," that is, belonging to it; or, "in regard to the name of the Lord." The fame of Solomon by the name of the Lord is the fame of Solomon, which so far belongs to the name of the Lord or stands in relation to it, as it was brought about by this, that the name of the Lord was attested in Solomon by the wisdom given to him.—חִידָה, riddle, is a very pointed sentence, מָשָׁל, indicating a deeper truth and leading to thought, comp. Ezek. xvii. 2, and Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 207.—This wisdom, couched in apophthegms and riddles, in which Solomon not only distinguished himself (v. 12), but according to the statement of Menander and Dius in Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 5—3, and *c. Ap.* i. 17), had an encounter with Hiram of Tyre, was quite a familiar exercise with the Arabs. How rich Arabia is in proverbs and riddles, so that it may be regarded as their native land, is proved by the vast collections of Ali Ben Abi Taleb and Meidani,[1] which certainly proceed from modern times (Meidani

unsuitable and superfluous—a purely subjective ground by which we might strike any possible thing out of the text. *(b.)* "It has also arisen merely from writing the preceding word שְׁלֹמֹה twice only with the transposition of the ל, thus לִשְׁמֹה, while the transcriber took the ה, which is often exchanged with י, for the usual abbreviation of the name Jehovah." But the transposition of ל and even the frequent exchange of ה with י being granted, to which however many considerations are opposed, this assumption falls to the ground, because, *(a.)* the occurrence of such abbreviations 300 B.C., when the change must have been effected, as the LXX. read לְשֵׁם יְהוָה, is incapable of proof; *(b.)* the abbreviation of the name יְהוָה never consists of a mere י, but of 'יי or יְיָ or ייי, comp. Buxtorf. *de abbrev. hebr. p.* 5 (*edit.* ii. 1640); and lastly, *(c.)* the letters ה and י in the old Hebrew writing, which was then in use, have too little resemblance to be readily exchanged with one another.

[1] Of the proverbs of Ali, Stickel says *(Sententiae Ali etc. Jenæ* 1834, *praef. p.* xi.) : *Siquidem tam immensus numerus est, tantaque varietas eorum ac dissimilitudo, ut inveniendis iis omnibus vel solertissimum ingenium unius hominis impar sit habendum, nec possint nisi per conjunctam universae cujusdam nationis sapientiam e diuturna ac multiplici vitæ experientia haustam et per commune diversissimorum hominum acumen producta esse.*—J. Theod. Zenker, *biblioth. orient. fasc.* i. *(Lips.* 1840) p. 15 f. enumerates the different editions of the several parts.—The great collection of Meidani, consisting of 6000 proverbs, has been lately edited by Freytag (Bonn. 1838.) Comp. on other editions Zenker, *l. c. p.* 55.

lived in the 12th century), but retain a large amount of ancient proverbs and riddles. How deeply these proverbs were rooted in the life of the people, appears from the statement of Suyuti in the life of Aasha:[1] "the Arabs considered no one a good poet, who did not interweave his poems, whatever might be their contents, with wise sayings," and still more from the fact, that no inconsiderable part of the oldest traditions of the nation are deposited in these sayings and thereby preserved,[2] that formal encounters in wise sayings and riddles took place,[3] and that to the present day the common Arab has a proverb in his mouth for every occasion.[4] On the custom of proposing riddles, comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. No. 464.

Vv. 2 and 3. With a great train—camels bearing the products of her land, gold, spices, and precious stones, intended for presents to Solomon—came the queen of Jerusalem, (חַיִל denotes the whole following of men [עֲבָדִים, v. 13] and camels), and spake to him of all that she had in her heart. These words we are not with the ancients to refer to *gravissimas et sacras quæstiones:* they only denote all the discourses, by which she wished to prove the wisdom of Solomon, especially, as we are to conclude from v. 13, the questions which she proposed to him for solution. Nor are we to understand the words: "there was not any thing hid from the king, that he told her not," of the mysteries of religion and of the worship of God, but only of questions, the meaning of which lay not on the surface, but was deeply hidden; for

[1] Comp. Weil, the Poetical Literature of the Arabs before and immediately after Mohammed. Stuttg. 1837. p. 41.

[2] See *Monumenta antiquiss. historiae Arabum ed. J. G. Eichhorn, Gothae* 1775. *pag.* 14 *sqq.*

[3] Let a man only read the Makamat of Hariri distinguished by an endless profusion of puns and riddles, which is made accessible to all by the masterly German translation of Fr. Rückert.

[4] See "Arabic proverbs, or the customs and usages of the modern Egyptians explained from the (Arabic) proverbs prevalent at Cairo," translated and illustrated by J. L. Burkhardt, published by W. Ouseley, German by Kirmss, Weimar 1834.—Comp. also the "Collection of some Arabic proverbs, which are taken from sticks and staves, by Reiske," mostly extracted from Meidani, Lpz. 1758, in which among others one is given, on which Reiske remarks: "From this we may learn the wit of the Arabs and see an example of the riddles, with which the wit of the Orientals is so much occupied. The queen from the kingdom of Arabia may have proposed such to Solomon," (p. 23.)

it was not Solomon's religious character, but his wisdom, that brought her to Jerusalem.

Vv. 4, 5. הַבַּיִת is not the temple (Seb. Schm.), but the royal palace, for הבית is different from בית יהוה and the things mentioned, v. 5, point to the palace.—The meat of his table, that is, as well the varied fare, that came to the royal table (vv. 2, 3), as the costly equipage of the table (v. 21.) מוֹשַׁב עֲבָדָיו, the seat of his servants, and מַעֲמַד מְשָׁרְתָיו, the stand of his ministers, denote the places appointed in the palace for the ministers and servants of the king, which were probably wisely arranged and splendidly furnished. Seb. Schm. incorrectly explains: "the sitting of the ministers at the table," and de Wette: "the sitting of his servants and the standing of his ministers;" for מוֹשַׁב denotes only the place of sitting, not the sitting, and מַעֲמַד only the standing-place. מַלְבֻּשֵׁיהֶם, their clothing which they had from the king, and which was no doubt distinguished for its splendour. מַשְׁקָיו is mostly rendered according to the LXX.: *οἰνοχόους αὐτοῦ*, and the *Vulg. pincernas ejus*, but being named among mere things can only be understood with the Chald. שְׁקְיוּתֵיה of *repotatoria*, as Gen. xl. 21, denoting not merely the drinks but the whole drinking apparatus. The writer of Chronicles has certainly understood it of drinking.—עֹלָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲלֶה, the LXX.; Chald., Syr., *Vulg.* render; the burnt-offerings which he offered. But עלה cannot have this meaning here. What could the queen of Sheba have seen to admire in the burnt-offerings? She saw also only the palace and its arrangements. עלה means here *ascensus*, as in Ezek. xl. 26, עלותו, where 15 *Codd.* read in the *Sing.* עלתו, עולתו. In 2 Chr. ix. 4, it is therefore correctly explained by עֲלִיָּתוֹ. No account remains of the nature of this ascent by which the king went to the house of God. From our text it can only be inferred, that it was a work of art, and from 2 Ki. xvi. 18, it appears that the king had a private entrance into the temple, which at all events is to be sought on the west side of the temple area. On this side is the gate Shallekheth, שלכת in the ascending street, that is, the way going up to the temple from the ravine between Zion and Moriah, 1 Chr. xxvi. 16. The Rabbins hold this way to be identical

with the עֹלָה of our passage, comp. Lightfoot *descr. templi Hieros.* *v.* 1 (*Opp.* i. *p.* 559), and combine the gate Shallekheth with a western gate mentioned by Josephus in the second temple (ἡ μὲν εἰς βασίλεια τείνουσα, τῆς ἐν μέσῳ φάραγγος εἰς δίοδον ἀπειλημμένης. *Antiq.* xv. 11, 5.)

V. 6—9. Beside herself from astonishment (לֹא הָיָה בָהּ עוֹד רוּחַ), she confesses to Solomon, that by the report brought to her of his affairs and his wisdom, which appeared to her incredible, she had not learned the half of that which her eyes now saw, and she not only declares his servants happy, who were able to hear his wisdom in his presence, but also praises Jehovah his God, that he, out of his everlasting love to his people Israel, had given them such a king to do judgment and justice.—This praising of Jehovah (v. 9), which presupposes faith in the true God, led the old theologians to the opinion that this queen turned to the worship of Jehovah, and conversed with Solomon on religious matters. But the remark above made with regard to Hiram finds its application here also, that a certain recognition of Jehovah as God of Israel was consistent with polytheism. How little ground there is for the notion of her conversion may be inferred from the circumstance that she never brings an offering to the temple.

Vv. 10—12. Among the presents which she brought with her is especially prominent the abundance of spices (בְּשָׂמִים), among which was certainly a quantity of real Arabic balsam, بَلَسَان, even if בשׂם does not specially denote balsam.—V. 11. The mention of these costly presents gives occasion to the narrator to add here also, that the fleet of Ophir, besides gold, brought also precious stones and red sandal wood. On אַלְמֻגִּים, comp. my treatise on die Hiram-Salom. Schiffahrt, p. 51 ff.—Of this wood, the like of which never came to Judea afterwards, Solomon made מִסְעָד, balustrades, or, according to 2 Chr. ix. 11 מְסִלּוֹת, stairs for the temple and his palace, and musical instruments; כִּנֹּרוֹת, κινύραι, *citharae*, guitar-like instruments, comp. Winer, bibl. R.W. ii. p. 174 f.; נְבָלִים, νάβλα, harps, comp. Winer i. p. q. i. p. 547.

V. 13. And King Solomon gave unto the Queen of Sheba all that she wished and desired, beside that which he gave her כְּיַד הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה, *pro potentia, i.e. opulentia regis*, what he otherwise presented to her after the royal manner of Solomon, that is, beside that which he must have given her as royal remuneration for the presents brought to him according to the oriental custom of sovereigns.[1]

V. 14 ff. Solomon's revenues and their expenditure. V. 14, 16. In gold, yearly, 666 talents = (1,900,875 Marks) £3,646,350, beside that which came in from the merchants, vassal-kings, and governors. תָּרִים and רֹכְלִים are merchants, but the difference between them is hard to determine. תּוּר means *circumire explorandi causa*, Num. xiii. 16, 17, and elsewhere, and רָכַל *circumire sive negotiandi, sive explorandi causa*. After the example of R. Levi, *Gussetius* understands תרים of the great merchants, רכלים of the small traders and dealers; but רֹכֵל denotes the wholesale merchant (Ezek. xxvii. 13, 15, etc.), as well as the retailer, Neh. iii. 31, 32.—תּוּר and תָּר, except in our passage, and its parallel in Chronicles, nowhere denote a merchant; others, therefore, following the *Vulg.*, *viri qui super vectigalia erant*, have been disposed to understand it of the *publicani, qui merces in regnum invectas et redimendas inspiciebant et explorabant;* the Chald. and Syr. render it by אוּמָנַיָּא, ܐܘܡܢܐ, *artificer*, which at all events is only a conjecture. As arbitrarily Seb. Schm. explains: *exploratores metallorum in ipsis Palaestinae fodinis hic inde latitantium*, since תּוּר never means *explorare metalla*.—מַלְכֵי הָעֶרֶב are vassal-kings, not, as Gesen. (Gesch. der hebr. Spr. p. 42 and *thes.* ii. 1064) with the Chald. assumes, מַלְכֵי סוּמְכָוָתָא kings of

[1] The same thought is expressed, 2 Chr. ix. 12, by the words, beside that which she had brought the king, which the Targum rightly explains, לבד די יהב לה חלופי מה דאיתיאה לות מַלְכָּא *praeter id, quod reddidit ei mutua munera pro eis, quae attulit illa regi cf. Targ. in Chron. edid. Beck* p. 106. On the contrary Gesen. (Gesch. d. hebr. Spr. p. 42), de Wette, Einl. p. 250 (ed. 5), and others wish to find in the words of Chronicles a proof of the writer's unacquaintance with the Hebrew language, while Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 213) has recourse again to corruption of the text. Comp. Hävern. Einl. i. 1, p. 239.

auxiliary or allied nations. עֵרֶב is a mixed multitude of men, such especially as attach themselves to a nation, Ex. xii. 38, or dwell among a nation as aliens, Neh. xiii. 3, hence a multitude of hirelings, Ezek. xxx. 5, comp. Hävern. on the passage, Jer. xxv. 20, l. 37.—Accordingly מלכי הערב are kings over mixed races, and indeed particularly, according to Jer. xxv. 25, races belonging to Arabia Deserta הַשֹּׁכְנִים בַּמִּדְבָּר. In 2 Chr. ix. 14, therefore, is הָעֶרֶב is rightly explained by עֲרָב, by which is to be understood not the whole peninsula of Arabia, but *haud ita magnus terræ tractus ab oriente et austro Palestinæ (Ges. thes.* ii. 1066), comp. Hävern. on Ezek. p. 471, because all these races were tributary to Solomon.[1]—פַּחוֹת governor is of Persian origin, and is probably connected with the Sanscrit *paksha*, *socius*, *amicus*, in Pracrit *pakkha*, which in the old Persian will have been *pakha*. Comp. Benfey and Stern, die Monatsnamen p. 195.

V. 16 ff. Solomon made 500 state-shields, 200 larger or targets, צִנִּים *θυρεοί*, *scuta*, and 300 smaller מָגִנִּים *ἀσπίδες*, *clypei*. As the shields of the ancients usually were (comp. Jahn, bibl. Archaeol. ii. 2, § 217, and Winer, bibl., R.W. ii. p. 482), these also were no doubt made of wood, but instead of leather were overlaid with fine gold. 600 shekels were used in the gilding of each target, and three manehs or 300 shekels for each shield, that is, 35 talents, as the shekel,= $\frac{1}{100}$ part of a maneh, is the royal shekel (2 Sam. xiv. 26), of which 6000 make a talent.[2]—These state-shields were hung up in the palace of Solomon, the house

[1] There is therefore no foundation for the charge of misunderstanding or total ignorance of Hebrew, brought against the writer of Chronicles on account of עֲרָב by Gesen. (Gesch. der hebr. Spr. p. 42), Gramberg (die Chronik p. 64), and de Wette (Einleit. p. 250.)

[2] Quite inconceivable is the conjecture of Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 90) concerning our passage and 2 Chr. ix. 15 f., when he denies the universally acknowledged fact, that in statements of weight the word שֶׁקֶל is often omitted, and 600 of gold is said for 600 shekels of gold (comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 700), and wishes to change מֵאוֹת v. 17 into מָנִים, and besides denies that שְׁלֹשֶׁת מָנִים is = שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת 2 Chr. ix. 16, which admits of no doubt, comp. Bertheau, Gesch. der Isr. p. 25 ff.

of the forest of Lebanon, but were plundered along with other treasures by the Egyptian king Shishak under Rehoboam, xiv. 26. Concerning other golden shields, comp. Winer bibl. R.W., ii. p. 483.—זָהָב שָׁחוּט. Of the different meanings proposed for שָׁחוּט that of Kimchi is the most probable; שָׁחוּט = שָׁטוּחַ *aurum diductum, i.e., quod facile ceræ instar expanditur malleove diducitur* (Fürst, *Concord. p.* 1130): for the explanation of Gesen. and Winer *aurum jugulatum, i.e., mixtum et alio metallo temperatum*, irrespective of this that Solomon would have used no alloyed but the finest possible gold for such state-shields, has no etymological ground. Then that the Arabs use the *verb.* سخط, *jugulare*, of wine, as *jugulare Falernum Martial.* i. 19, for wine mixed with water (comp. Gesen. on Is. i. 22) proves nothing, because the wine is actually put to death, that is, robbed of its strength, by mixing with water which we are not at liberty at once to transfer to the alloying of gold, especially as the Hebrews employ not שָׁחַט but מָהַל, to cut off, for the mingling of wine.

Vv. 18—20. Solomon's great throne of ivory overlaid with gold. כִּסֵּא־שֵׁן is not a throne made entirely of ivory, but according to the analogy of הֵיכְלֵי שֵׁן Ps. xlv. 9, בֵּית הַשֵּׁן 1 Ki. xxii. 39, בָּתֵּי הַשֵּׁן Am. iii. 15, מִטּוֹת שֵׁן Am. vi. 4, a throne veneered with ivory. The gilding is to be so understood, that only the wood and other metals are covered with gold, and the ivory is inserted within the gilded parts. (מוּפָז *aurum depuratum, i.e., praestantissimum*, comp. *Gesen. thes.* ii. 1096 and *Fürstii Concord. p.* 895.) To the throne were six steps, the back above was rounded,[1] and there were arms on both sides of the seat (מְקוֹם הַשָּׁבֶת), beside which stood two lions (probably of cast metal gilt. Besides, on both sides stood lions, two on every step.

[1] Instead of the curved back (רֹאשׁ עָגוֹל) a golden footstool (כֶּבֶשׁ בַּזָּהָב) is mentioned 2 Chr. ix. 18, which was fastened with the steps to the throne (the *plur.* מָאֳחָזִים refers to כֶּבֶשׁ and מַעֲלוֹת). Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 214) here also cuts the knot, as he proposes to trace the deviation to an error in transcription; for the words have no resemblance whatever, on account of which they could be exchanged for one another.

The lions were emblems of sovereignty. But the whole throne was a work of such splendour, that the historian remarks, that the like was not made in any kingdom.[1]

V. 21 f. All the drinking cups and vessels also in the forest-house of Lebanon were of the finest gold,[2] not of silver, because this was of no account; as Solomon had also a fleet of Tarshish at sea, which, sailing with the fleet of Hiram, returned once every three years laden with gold, silver, and other valuables.[3] בַּיָּם means on the Mediterranean Sea; הַיָּם never denotes the Red Sea, on which J. D. Michaelis founds the hypothesis, that the fleet circumnavigated Africa.—Tarshish is not to be sought

[1] In modern times certainly thrones are found, which are much more magnificent, comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 176 ff., where such are described.

[2] Harmer in Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 179 f. reports similar luxury of the modern Persian kings.

[3] Bredow (Untersuch. über einzelne Gegenstände der alten Gesch. Geogr. u. Chronol. ii. p. 252 ff.) has on very insufficient grounds identified the navigation to Tarshish with that to Ophir, of which mention is made v. 11 and ix. 26 f., whereas not only the name fleet of Tarshish speaks for the difference of the two, but also the length of the voyage was different,—the voyages to Ophir were made yearly, the fleet of Tarshish made only one voyage in three years,—and lastly, with the exception of gold, the fleet of Tarshish brought quite different commodities from those of Ophir, among the metals namely silver was the chief article, as appears from the mention of the Tarshish trade precisely in this connexion, whereas Arabia, where Ophir lay, had no silver, and therefore only by the voyages to Tartessus, which was rich in silver, could this metal become so common that it was of no account, or, according to the hyperbolical expression, was made as common as stones. See the farther discussion of this point in my treatise über die Hiram-Salom. Schiffahrt p. 32—36 and 71 ff. We might therefore wonder how so uncritical a work as that of Bredow could find so general acceptance among theologians (Gesen., Winer, de Wette, Gramb., Movers, etc.), were it not explained by a very uncritical motive, namely, that another reason might be found for the suspicion entertained by de Wette from dogmatical prejudices against Chronicles, which explains אֳנִי תַרְשִׁישׁ by אֳנִיּוֹת הֹלְכוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ (2 Chr. ix. 21.) Therefore still even now, after Movers has assented to the opposite party in his half defence of Chronicles, p. 254, not only de Wette (Einl. p. 250), but also Winer (bibl. R.W. ii., p. 702 f.) and Tuch (Hall. A. L. Z. 1835. No. 80) maintain this view, without refuting the grounds, which I have adduced in my treatise on this navigation, p. 71—106.

in India or Cilicia, but is the old celebrated Phœnician colony Tartessus in Spain.[1] To this agree also the products, which this fleet brought, beside gold and silver, in which all Spain abounded in ancient times (*Metallis plumbi, ferri, aeris,* argenti, auri *tota ferme Hispania scatet, Plin. hist. nat.* iii. 3, comp. also the many testimonies of the ancients to the abundance of silver in Spain in *Bocharti Phal. p.* 169 *sq.*), שֶׁנְהַבִּים, קוֹפִים and תֻכִּיִּים, according to the current explanation, ivory, apes, and peacocks.[2]—שנהבים the Syr. and Arab. render by elephants, but LXX. ὀδόντες ἐλεφάντινοι, *Vulg. ebur*, and most expositors follow them. The word is unquestionably compounded of שֵׁן, tooth, generally used in the Old Testament for ivory, and הָבִּים, which, however, is not connected with the Sanscrit *ibhas*, elephant,[3] but is formed from the Coptic EBOY, *elephas*, with the *art.* הַ, and denotes elephant's teeth, comp. Lassen Ztschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl. iv. 1, p. 13.—קֹפִים denotes, according to the old versions and the Rabbins, apes, and is probably connected with κῆπος, κῆβος, κεῖπος, *cephus*, a kind of longtailed ape, perhaps also with the Sanscrit *kapi*, without, however, being entitled to conclude with

[1] This is now universally acknowledged, and the hypothesis of Movers (Kölln. Zeitschr. für Theol. u. Philos. vol. xviii. p. 107), that תַּרְשִׁישׁ denotes partly *Thasus*, an island near Samothrace, partly *Tharsis* in Cyprus, has been rightly rejected as groundless by Winer i. p. q.

[2] How these products might all be brought by the fleet trading to Tartessus I have shown in my often cited treatise, p. 90 ff. What Spain itself had not might be purchased during the voyage out or back on the north coast of Africa, as this according to Strabo *l.* xvii. 5, Herodot. *l.* iv. 191 and 194, and Diodor. Sic. xx. 58, etc., was not only rich in elephants and apes, but in Lybia, as according to Herod. *l.* ii. 32, a great part of the African coast on the Mediterranean is called, peacocks also were to be found, and indeed were considered holy, comp. *Eustathius comm. in Iliad* xxii. (*tom.* iv. p. 225 *ed. Lips.*)

[3] Ag. Benary (Berl. Jahrb. f. wissensch. Krit. 1831 May, No. 96), has urged this connexion in favour of the hypothesis, that the Tarshish fleet traded to India. But it is decidedly against the derivation from the Indian that the elephant in all other Shemitic dialects and even in the Persian is called phil or pil; had the Hebrews therefore received the ivory from India, it would certainly have been by means of the mercantile Sabaeans, and we should either find Shenhabbim among the Arabs, or the Hebrews would have received the name phil for elephant along with the teeth of this animal.

Gesen. (thes. iii. p. 1208), that the Greeks and Shemites received the name with the animal from the Indians. For according to all testimonies of the ancients (see my treatise ü. die Hiram. Salom. Schiffahrt, p. 96), the native country of the *κῆποι* is not India, but Ethiopia, and the Arabs, who are also Shemites, call the ape usually قِرْدٌ, and have besides twelve terms for the different sorts or kinds of this animal, but not one has the slightest resemblance to *koph* or *kapi*.—תֻּכִּיִּים is usually explained according to the old versions by peacocks; others, however, understand also a kind of ape, but without any good ground. The word probably denotes *aves Numidicae*, a choice delicacy of the later Romans, which comes from *Tucca*, a town of Mauretania and Numidia.[1]

In vv. 23—25 all is comprised which was still to be related concerning the wisdom, riches, and revenues of Solomon.—Vv. 23 and 24 refer to vv. 9—14.—Attracted by his wisdom strangers year by year came and brought as presents gold and silver vessels, garments, armour, spices, horses and mules. V. 26 is only a repetition of v. 6, comp. also ix. 19. Vv. 26—29 stand word for word in 1 Chr. i. 14—18. On v. 27 comp. the remarks on v. 21, and what is said of the immense accumulation of cedars in Jerusalem finds its explication in the numerous buildings of Solomon. שִׁקְמִים, *sycomori*, mulberry trees. These have now become rare in Palestine, and grow in numbers only in Egypt about Cairo, but were anciently so common in the low grounds of Palestine, that the Israelites used them as common building

[1] See the farther demonstration in my oft-cited treatise, p. 104 ff. The Reviewer of it in the Jena L. Z. 1836. No. 194 p. 110 remarks, "that even in Spain itself, especially in *Hispania Baetica*, among the Turduli, the descendants of the Phenicians there, a town *Tucci* (*Ptol.* ii. *Plin. h. n.* 1), or, (according to Strabo iii. 141), *Tuccis* was found, from which the תֻּכִּיִּים might naturally have received their name." This is possible, but we must not on this account give up the attempt to assign the meaning of תכיים. In favour of the usual interpretation of the word Ag. Benary i. p. q., and Gesen. in the *Lex. man.* urge the resemblance of תֻּכִּיִּים to the Malabaric togeï, peacock, mentioned by Adelung in the Mithridates, but this supposed togeï is not yet itself sufficiently ascertained, comp. Lassen i. p. q. p. 29.

timber; comp. Is. ix. 9, on which Theodoret remarks: *τούτων (συκαμίνων) ἡ Παλαιστίνη πεπλήρωται.* Comp. in general Warnekros, *histor. natur. Sycomori* in Eichhorn's Repertor. Bd. ii. p. 224 f., especially p. 232 f. and Winer bibl. R.W. ii. p. 75 ff.—The sycamore-forests in the low lands of Judah (בַּשְּׁפֵלָה) were moreover, according to 1 Chr. xxvii. 28, royal domains.

Vv. 28, 29. The understanding of these not very easy verses, concerning which the old expositors formed many guesses and conjectures (comp. Bochart. *hieroz.* i. *p.* 170 *sq.*, Beck, *paraphr. chald. libr. Chron.* ii. 7 *sq.* and *Lud. de Dieu, crit. sacr. p.* 76), depends on the meaning of the word מִקְוֵה, which some explain of fine linen, *byssus* (for example Seb. Schm., Cleric., etc.), others have considered the name of a country or town *Koa* (Chald., Jerome, Vulg., J. D. Mich., *Supplem. p.* 1271, and Mos. Recht iii. p. 331 ff., lastly Maurer), and others still have understood by it a tax. (So Dathe and Tychsen *de commerc. et navigat. Hebr.* in the *Commentat. Gotting. Vol.* xvi. *p.* 156.) The right sense has been made out by Gesen. (*thes.* iii. 1202), who, retaining here also the meaning of מִקְוֵה, ascertained from other passages, namely, *confluxus, congregatio* (comp. Gen. i. 10; Ex. vii. 19; Lev. xi. 36), v. 28 renders: *Adducebantur autem equi Salomonis ex Aegypto et agmen mercatorum regiorum petebant agmen (equorum) pretio certo* (a troop of royal merchants always fetched a troop of horses at a fixed price.) This exposition certainly connects מקוה with סֹחֲרֵי, contrary to the accents, but is justly to be preferred to the Masoretic interpunction,[1] as this is obviously connected with the erroneous explanation of מקוה by fine linen or tribute.—The first words of the verse, וּמוֹצָא . . . מִמִּצְרַיִם are *nominat. absol.* "As to the bringing of the horses of Solomon out of Egypt." מוֹצָא is here the manner and way of exit, the removal, export, not the place of exit, as Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 301 assumes.—The transport took

[1] Böttcher (Proben p. 170) has certainly endeavoured to explain the words according to the Hebrew accents, but his rendering and interpretation: "and a troop the king's merchants fetched, a troop at a price, that is, the king's traders fetched troop by troop always at a definite price; the horses were in every delivery fetched and counted," is too forced and unnatural to meet with general acceptance.

place in large troops like caravans, as the merchants in the East at the present day travel with their wares from place to place. They may also have been very numerous, as these merchants provided horses not only for Solomon but also for the Hittite and Syrian kings.[1] The price was a low one, 150 shekels for a horse, that is, reckoned according to the royal shekel, £8 or £9, and 600 shekels, about £35, for a chariot. מֶרְכָּבָה denotes here not the war chariot by itself, but as רֶכֶב, 2 Sam. viii. 4, 10, 18; Ezek. xxxix. 20, the chariot with the team of horses belonging to it,[2] probably three horses (comp. remarks on v. 6), not *quadriga* (Cler., Seb. Schm., etc.), as the conclusion that if a horse cost 150 shekels, a four-horse chariot would be got for 600, is by no means certain. מַלְכֵי הַחִתִּים are Canaanitish kings in general; חִתִּים stands here in the wider sense for Canaanites, as Jos. i. 4, 2 Ki. vii. 6, and Ezek. xvi. 3, comp. Gesen. *thes.* i. 541, and Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 275 f. The Hittite and Syrian kings, who obtained horses from Egypt through the merchants of Solomon, were partly at least the vassals of Solomon, as his sovereignty extended over all the Canaanites, except the Phenicians, and over a part of Syria.

[1] This trade proves the great wealth of Egypt in horses, which is attested not only by the biblical accounts, as in the Pentateuch, according to which horses held the first place among the live stock of the Egyptians, Gen. xlvii. 17; Ex. ix. 3; Deut. xvii. 16, comp. Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 4, and in the other books, according to which a large number of horse and merchants were always found in the Egyptian armies, Ex. xiv. 6, 7, 9, xv. 1; 2 Chr. xii. 3; 2 Ki. xviii. 24; Is. xxxi. 1, 3; Jer. xlvi. 4, 9; Ezek. xvii. 15, but also by the monuments, comp. Wilkinson in Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 4, and the accounts of the Greeks and Romans. (See them collected in Bochart's *Hieroz.* i. p. 169 f.)

[2] Ἅρμα and *currus* also are used in this sense, comp. Gesen. *thes. s. v.* רֶכֶב and Winer *lexic. s. v.*

## CHAPTER XI.

SOLOMON'S POLYGAMY AND IDOLATRY, VV. 1—13; HIS ADVERSARIES, VV. 14—40. HIS DEATH, VV. 41—43.

The idolatry, into which Solomon fell in his advanced age, appears, in so wise and god-fearing a king as Solomon proved himself to be in the dedication of the temple, so surprising, that many have conceived it impossible to reconcile the two things, and have either declared Solomon's idolatry psychologically impossible (Jarchi, Abarb., Heidegger, *dissert. sel.* ii. p. 255 sq., and especially Justi, On Solomon's supposed idolatry in Eichhorn's Repert. xvi. p. 120 ff.), or from this idolatry drawn the the conclusion, that Solomon could have had no such clear knowledge of God as traditional history ascribes to him (Gramberg. Religionsid. i. p. 502, Vatke, d. Relig. d. A. T. p. 309, 361.) "But against so violent a solution of the contradiction it is sufficient to intimate, that there are men in history of no less consequence, who were apostates." Thus Br. Bauer. d. Relig. d. A. T. ii. p. 210 justly replies to this averment, although we cannot adopt his farther explanation of the matter, because it rests on a philosophical construction of history, which we hold to be incorrect. In the first place as to the grounds, on which Justi endeavours to prove the impossibility of Solomon becoming an idolater, collectively taken they come to the following reasoning. "Solomon, the son of the most fervent and devout worshipper of the true God, the model and as it were standard of the pure worship of God for all future kings of Israel, and educated by him and the prophet Nathan, at the same time the wisest man of his age, this wise man, who, moreover, as a naturalist, so earnestly contemplated and studied the works of the Creator, an idolater! How is this credible? In so exalted wisdom the folly of idolatry is inconceivable!" Here three things are urged, descent from a pious father, religious education, and great wisdom. But the two former prove nothing, as experience knows a thousand cases where the children of pious parents, and of pure religious education, become evil and ungodly, and can here be the less manifested, as Solomon long walked in the

footsteps of his pious father, and was sincerely devoted to the true God and his service. But if exalted wisdom is declared to be incompatible with idolatry, the nature of idolatry is altogether misunderstood, and its origin is transferred to the head, whereas it is rooted in the heart and springs from the sensual propensities, impulses, and desires, from the lust of the flesh. Great wisdom does not guard from the folly of idolatry, as so many great philosophers prove. It is a consideration quite as external, when Justi especially urges the great wisdom of Solomon and his exalted notions of God, as when Winer (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 430) remarks on the contrary, that the wisdom of Solomon was more of a political than of a religious cast, against which at least the words of Solomon bear testimony. Vatke's objection (i. p. q. p. 309) is much more profound: "Had Solomon had so clear and thorough a knowledge of the truth, as tradition ascribes to him, especially in the prayer at the dedication of the temple, it would have been absolutely impossible for him to have afterwards sunk into idolatry, and led a licentious and ungodly life, especially as the contradiction of the theoretical knowledge and the practical life was much less manifest in the higher antiquity, and always presupposes that an individual either externally admits the truth already existing around him, or is attached to a one-sided contemplative tendency." If we abide by the history handed down to us, we can neither ascribe to Solomon in the first years of his reign a one-sided contemplative tendency, nor a merely external admission of the truth, because the contrary is decidedly testified by his prayers at Gibeon, and at the dedication of the temple. Even if we were freely to admit that there is no such glaring contradiction between his theoretical knowledge and practical life, as is to be found in many men at the present day, yet we cannot regard the conclusion of Vatke as well founded, because in the first place he presumes in the spiritual life of men an unchangeableness, which is contradicted by experience, and in the next place leaves altogether out of consideration the powerful influence, which the senses exercise on the knowledge and the general spiritual life. If Solomon were represented as an idolater at the very time when he dedicated the temple, then might this representation be psychologically inconceivable. But this is not

found in the Books of Kings, nor is a sudden immediate transition from the pure worship of God to the worship of idols asserted, nay not once a complete apostasy from Jehovah, not even in the last years of his reign, but only, that his heart was no longer entirely devoted to Jehovah (v. 4), but through his many strange wives was alienated from him, that he went after idols, and built altars to them (vv. 5—8.) Thus Solomon was charged with, not a total renunciation of Jehovah, but a syncretistic mixture of the service of Jehovah and the worship of idols. But this syncretistic theocrasy by no means excludes in him the proper service of idols, as Hävern. Einleit. i. 2, p. 583 thinks, but consisted directly in this, that he offered sacrifice three times a-year to Jehovah in the temple (ix. 25), and at the same time burned incense, and offered sacrifice on the high places of the idols of his wives. He wished to serve many Lords, whereby, however, the worship only and exclusively due to the true God was not only injured, but assimilated to idolatry.—The cause of this idolatry the historian finds in the many strange wives, who turned away the heart of the King in his old age from the Lord.[1] On the contrary Vatke p. 361 objects, that "the connexion with them includes an inclination to foreign customs, and a partial idolatry." Herein lies a certain amount of truth, and many accordingly have censured his connection with Pharaoh's daughter, which, however, is not authorised by the present historical nar-

[1] What Justi i. p. q. p. 133 ff. remarks to the contrary is so superficial, that the most it merits is to be mentioned in a note. If here, he thinks, the dim notion of the predominance of the wives is not to decide as it were dictatorially, it is utterly incredible, because, first, Solomon was in earnest about matters of religion, and was not accustomed to act the inamorato, as appears from this, that he did not allow the Egyptian princess to dwell in the house in which the ark was placed, and, next, no great temptation could have arisen from his wives, because they did not regard their own religion as alone conferring salvation, and in the restraint in which Oriental, and especially royal, wives lived, were unable to exercise much influence. But the first ground holds only for the time when Solomon adhered to the Lord with all his heart, and the second is contravened partly by the great charm, which sensuous heathenism has for the natural heart of man, partly by the often experimentally proved influence, which the Oriental wives even in their restraint exercise over their lords and husbands, who are not seldom entirely ruled and guided by the intrigues of the Seraglio.

rative, comp. vv. 1 and 2.—A certain inclination also to foreign customs may be conceived to be united with the true worship of God, as it is affirmed of Solomon in the early years of his reign; it is only a rock, on which the fidelity of the heart to the Lord may at last suffer shipwreck. But our narrative nowhere describes Solomon as a spotless saint; much more may we infer from the repeated warnings of God (comp. iii. 14, vi. 12, ix. 14 f.), that Solomon was long in danger of falling into idolatry. This danger was increased no doubt by the inclination to foreign customs, but this inclination itself was again occasioned by circumstances and relations of his reign, which must be regarded as remote concurring causes of his final fall. Among these is first to be reckoned the commerce carried on by Solomon, which on the one hand enhanced to a dangerous extent his love of splendour by the accumulation of great wealth, and produced a luxury scarcely to be reconciled with the simple manners of a pious theocrat, and on the other hand introduced a degree of tolerance toward heathen customs and religious views, which was scarcely consistent with the religion of Jehovah, while even the commerce itself was somewhat antitheocratic. Next the great wisdom of Solomon might become itself a perilous rock, not so much in the respect dwelt upon by J. J. Hess (Gesch. Dav. u. Tal. ii. p. 413), that an extravagant spirit of enquiry might easily entice him from the open and serene regions of the kingdom of truth into magic, the dark territory of the kingdom of lies, and so lead the way to superstition, as much more because the wide-spread fame of this wisdom brought a multitude of men to Jerusalem, and placed them in connexion with him, whose homage not only awakened vanity in his heart, but led him to a still greater tolerance, and approximation to the heathen world. None of these things, however, are censured in our narrative, because these could not necessarily lead to idolatry, but only be mediate occasions of it, inasmuch as they diminished the partition wall between the true worship of God and the heathen idolatry, and prepared the way for the possibility of the apostasy. The proper immediate cause of his fall was his connexion with many foreign heathen wives (v. 2.)

Vv. 1 and 2. After what has been remarked on iii. 1 the daughter of Pharaoh cannot here be put in the same category

with the other foreign wives of Solomon. Neither is this implied in the words, but rather by the expression וְאֶת־בַּת־פַּרְעֹה, "*et quidem una cum filia Pharaonis, h. e. praeter filiam Ph. cf. v.* 25," as Maurer rightly expounds, the Egyptian king's daughter is separated from the other wives, so that the censure pronounced upon them does not apply to her.[1] And it is censured only, (*a*) that Solomon, contrary to the law (Deut. xvii. 17), took many (רַבּוֹת) strange wives, (*b*) that he took Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women—from the nations with which Israel was to have no intercourse (v. 2.) Because the law expressly forbade marriage only with Canaanites (comp. Deut. v. 1—3 with Ex. xxxiv. 16), Mich. (Mos. R. ii. § 100) would refer the words, "Of the nations concerning which the Lord commanded," etc. only to the Sidonians and Hittites; but this restriction is arbitrary; on the contrary our verse extends that Divine prohibition to the nations collectively named in v. 1, as Ezr. ix. 2 ff., x. 3; Neh. xiii. 23, and in this there is no rigour extending beyond the law, as Winer (bibl. R.W. i. p. 353) asserts, but it is only an interpretation of that prohibition corresponding to the spirit of the law. For the law referring in the first instance only to the Canaanites, who were devoted to destruction, involved a reference to all nations, to whom the *ratio: "ne in idololatriam a superstitiosis mulieribus pellicerentur," Cler.*, annexed in both passages to the law applied.[2] The

[1] Only by a false view of אֶת as *nota Accus.* and of וְ as meaning *imprimis* could the old expositors have been led to the conclusion, that the historian censures this marriage in a special manner, as for example Calmet remarks: Scripture often insists on the marriage of the daughter of Pharaoh with Solomon, as if to mark, that it was the source and commencement of all his errors.

[2] If, according to Deut. xxiii. 4, the Ammonite and the Moabite were not to be received into the congregation of Israel, not even to the tenth generation, and even of the Edomites, according to v. 8, only the children in the third generation, much less was intermarriage with them permitted, if, as was the case with Solomon, they gave occasion to idolatry. In Deut. xxiii. 8, the Egyptians indeed are placed in the same category with the Edomites; according to which marriage with an Egyptian would be as objectionable as with an Edomite, if both were equally prejudicial to the faith of the Israelites; which, however, according to the above, was not the case with the daughter of Pharaoh.

words בָּכֶם . . . לֹא־תָבֹאוּ refer in form to Jos. xxiii. 12, in matter, as the like words of Joshua, they rest on Ex. xxxiv. 16, and Deut. vii. 1—3.—בָּהֶם דָּבַק Solomon clave to them.—דבק denotes first the attachment of the husband to his wife, Gen. ii. 24, but in Deut. iv. 4, x. 20, xiii. 5, xxx. 20, it is used of attachment to Jehovah. Our author designedly chooses this expression to show that Solomon rendered the devotion, which the Lord demanded, to the heathen nations and their women.

Vv. 3—8 give the historical vouchers for vv. 1 and 2; v. 3 for the נָשִׁים רַבּוֹת v. 1;—700 wives, princesses, and 300 concubines. Solomon was certainly not impelled to take so many wives and concubines by sensuality and lust, but by vanity, and the endeavour to resemble in this respect, if not quite to surpass, the sovereigns of other nations, a part of whose luxury was as numerous a harem as possible.[1]—V. 4. For a time he withstood the danger to his spiritual state arising from the multitude of his wives, but לְעֵת זִקְנַת towards the time of his old age, when the flesh gained the preponderance over the spirit, his wives turned his heart to other gods, so that he, who had prayed for his people at the dedication of the temple, "let your heart be undividedly given to the Lord" (viii. 61), now himself began to divide his heart, so that it was no longer שָׁלֵם with Jehovah his God, but went after the gods of the Sidonians and Ammonites. —Solomon, moreover, was not extremely old.—V. 5. The phrase: הָלַךְ אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים is already in the Pentateuch a standing description of idolatry, so that there can be no doubt that Solomon lapsed into actual idolatry, and not merely, as Justi asserts, allowed his foreign wives the exercise of their hereditary religion. It certainly is not expressly recorded that he sacrificed to idols, but if he built them altars the sacrifice will scarcely have been wanting. For if he could reconcile the building of the altars of idols before the eyes of the whole people, and in

[1] Thus for example Darius Codomannus in his expedition against Alexander, according to Athenæus (*Deipnos. lib.* iii. c. 1), and Curtius (*vit. Alex. l.* iii. c. 3), took with him, certainly more from vanity than to gratify his lust, *regiæ pellices trecentæ sexaginta;* and other Oriental sovereigns have so many wives, that they cannot possibly know them all; comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 181.

sight of the temple dedicated to the Lord with the worship of Jehovah, he might certainly do so with regard to the offering of sacrifice on these altars. And even if he should actually have offered no sacrifice to idols, yet the building of their altars that others might sacrifice is no less idolatrous than if he himself sacrificed to idols. And how far the idolatry committed on these altars was from remaining a mere private worship of the foreign wives of Solomon may be seen from xiv. 22—24.

Vv. 5—8. Only three of the gods are expressly mentioned, Astarte of the Sidonians, Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, and Chemosh, the abomination of Moab. Although it is said, v. 8: "thus did he for all his strange wives," that is, went after their gods and built them altars, yet it is not probable that Solomon built altars for more than these three gods. For not only are no other altars of idols built by Solomon mentioned either here or 2 Ki. xxiii. 13, but these altars were sufficient for all his wives to worship their gods. For the Hittites and Edomites, of whom besides those named Solomon had wives, appear to have had no distinct idols peculiar to themselves.[1] The Hittites probably worshipped Astarte with the Sidonians, and the Edomites Milcom or Molech. In the whole Old Testament the gods of the Edomites are only mentioned in 2 Chr. xxv. 20, but none are named.[2] The Astarte (עַשְׁתֹּרֶת) of the Sidonians has been hitherto pretty generally (by Creuzer [Symb. u. Myth.], Münter [Relig. d. Karth.], Gesen., Winer, Hitzig, and others), identified with Asherah, until Movers, by convincing reasons, demonstrated the contrary.[3] This goddess is mentioned in the Old Testament

[1] Vatke certainly asserts, p. 361, that Solomon will have also established a separate worship for the daughter of Pharaoh, but must at the same time confess that in the whole subsequent period no trace of Egyptian idolatry is found in Judah, whereby his assertion with all its appended consequences is refuted. Comp. also the remarks on iii. 1.

[2] Herodotus (iii. 8) calls the Διόνυσος of the Arabs dwelling in the south of Palestine on the boarders of Egypt, by whom probably are to be understood the Edomites, Οὐροτάλ or Ὀροτάλ, which name Mov. i. p. q. p. 337 interprets *ignis Dei*, and identifies the god with Moloch.

[3] The doubts which de Wette (Archaeol. p. 322 f.) has raised against the proof given by Mov. of the diversity of Astarte and Asherah, are of no importance. Even if the עַשְׁתָּרוֹת Judg. ii. 13 be not different from the אֲשֵׁרוֹת iii. 7, the identity of the Sidonian

beside this verse and v. 33, only in 2 Ki. xxiii. 13; in the other passages (Judg. ii. 13, x. 6; 1 Sam. vii. 3, xii. 10, xxxi. 10), stands the *plur.* עַשְׁתָּרוֹת, almost always in connection with בְּעָלִים, which points to several forms of Astarte, so that the proper meaning of the Sidonian Astarte could not be determined from these passages, even if they actually contained any thing more definite concerning Astarte. It is inferred from the constant designation Astarte (Ashtoreth) of the Sidonians, that she was the national and tutelary divinity of the Sidonian Phœnicians, and this is confirmed by later writers (*Lydus, Achilles Tatius*), comp. Mov. i. p. q. 602. This goddess, whose worship was transplanted from Tyre to Carthage and there flourished greatly, is called by the Greeks and Romans *Οὐρανία Σεληναίη*, *Coelestis* and *Juno*, and is unquestionably the moon goddess, and not Venus, with whom *Cicero (de nat. Deor.* iii. 23), *Suidas*, and some others identify her, see Movers i. p. q.—Her name, עַשְׁתֹּרֶת, for which the Shemitic tongues afford no suitable etymology (as the very unfortunate etymologies of the ancients in Selden [*de diis Syr. p.* 158] and Bochart [*Can. et Phal. p.* 709] prove), points to an Upper Asiatic origin, and her identity with the Assyrian Persian Tanais, for which many testimonies and reasons speak, has been completely demonstrated by several inscriptions lately found in the ruins of old Carthage, in which the Carthaginian Astarte is also called Tanais and connected with Baal (comp. the 3, 2, 1, and 5 Carth. inscrip. in *Gesen. Monum. Phœn.* i. p. 168—177.) But the derivation of the name עַשְׁתֹּרֶת from the Pers. ستاره, ἀστήρ, star, proposed by Ges. (*thes.* ii. 1083), and approved by Movers (p. 607), is still very doubtful, although later Greek scholiasts and writers derive Ἀστάρτη from ἀστήρ (see Mov. p. 606), because the initial letter ע cannot be thus explained, the identity of the Syr. ܠܘܣܬܐ with ܐܣܬܪܐ is neither certain nor probable, but the two words are related to each other as עשתרת to

Astarte with the Canaanitish Asherah does not follow because the *plur.* עשתרות is not to be at once identified with the Sidonian עשתרת. The אֲשֵׁרִם, 2 Ki. xxiii. 14, however, do not belong to this Astarte, comp. remarks on the passage. The remaining doubts are removed by the subsequent confusion of the Syrian Asherah with the Assyrian Sidonian Astarte, which is acknowledged by Movers himself.

אשׁרה, the diversity of which Movers rightly affirms, and because the designation of this goddess as queen of the stars Ἀστροάρχη in Sabaism (*Herod.* v. 6, § 10) proves certainly the identity of Astarte with *Luna*, but not the correctness of the etymology in question. Concerning the worship of the Sidonian Astarte we know nothing farther than that the same Carthaginian chief goddess passed as *virginale numen (Augustin. de civit. Dei* ii. 26) παρθένος Ἀστάρτη (*Sanchun.* p. 30), bore the bull's head (comp. *Gesen. thes.* ii. 1082), was worshipped as the pure holy fire, and that her service was conducted by unmarried priestesses (comp. Mov. i. p. q. p. 608 f.)

Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, is identified by most (see Winer, bibl. R.W. ii. p. 118 ff., Gesen. *thes.* ii. 794 f., de Wette, Archæol. § 235 a.) with the child-devouring Molech, to whom from the time of Ahaz a place of sacrifice was erected at Jerusalem in the valley of Ben-Hinnom. In favour certainly of this is the circumstance, that Milcom is in v. 7 called Molech. Notwithstanding this denomination, however, we must with Movers i. p. q. p. 324 f. distinguish the child-devouring Molech from Milcom the national god of the Ammonites; for *(a)* the names are different. The Molech worshipped by the sacrifice of children is in Hebrew always הַמֹּלֶךְ with the article; the idol of the Ammonites, in v. 7 indeed also מֹלֶךְ without the article,[1] and in all other places, where it is mentioned, either Milcom (מִלְכֹּם, vv. 5—33, 2 Ki. xxiii. 13), or Malcam (מַלְכָּם, Jer. xlix. 1—3, Am. i. 15.)[2] *(b)* The two had different places of worship in Jerusalem; the Assyrian Molech was worshipped by the sacrifice of children in the valley of Ben-Hinnom, but the Ammonitish Milcom on a mountain situated east of Jerusalem, probably that afterwards called the Mount of Olives, and the places of worship of the two are also expressly distinguished in 2 Ki. xxiii. 10 and 13. Finally *(c)*, the sacrifices also were different. While Molech is

[1] Movers (die Phöniz. i. p. 325) regards מֹלֶךְ here as a gloss, and wishes to amend מִלְכֹּם, but without being authorised by critical grounds.

[2] In the passage Zeph. i. 5, מַלְכָּם, for which Hitzig would read מִלְכֹּם, denotes not specially the Ammonitish god, but Baal, who is called their king.

always named only in connexion with the sacrifice of children, not the slightest trace is found in the whole Old Testament of Milcom having been worshipped by the Israelites in this manner. —The abomination of the Moabites Camos (Chemosh) is at all events akin to Milcom. This may be inferred from the relationship of the two nations; it appears still more clearly from Judg. xi. 24, where Camos is even called the god of the Ammonites,[1] whereas in all other places (besides here, in vv. 3, 5, 7, and 33, only in Num. xi. 29; 2 Ki. xxiii. 13; Jer. xlviii. 7, 13, 46) god of the Moabites, and from this, that the two gods are regarded as the proper masters of these nations. In Num. xxi. 29 and Jer. xlviii. 46 the Moabites are called the people of Camos, and Jer. xlviii. 7, the nobles of Moab are designated as princes of Camos, as Am. i. 14; Jer. xlix. 3, the nobles of the Ammonites princes of Malcam; and according to Judg. ii. 24 Camos gave the Ammonites their land, as Jehovah the Israelites their inheritance, comp. Mov. i. p. q. p. 358 f.—Probably also the worship was in the main points alike. Of the worship of Milcom all accounts fail us, if we do not arbitrarily identify him with Molech. To Camos, also, the Israelites sacrificed no children, but he was certainly propitiated by the Moabites in times of great necessity with the sacrifice of children, 2 Ki. iii. 27, which in all probability the Ammonites did with their Milcom. Comp. still on 2 Ki. xvi.—Among the Greeks Camos is called, according to a notice of Eusebius,[2] Ariel, that is, lion of God as the war-god, not fire of God, as Mov. p. 334 and de Wette (Archæol. p. 328) erroneously explain.[3] As war-god he is repre-

[1] Not the Amorites, as Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 260, and de Wette, Archæol. p. 328, from a superficial view of this passage have concluded.

[2] Καλοῦσιν εἰς ἔτι καὶ νῦν Ἀριὴλ τὸ εἴδωλον αὐτῶν οἱ τὴν Ἀρεόπολιν οἰκοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ σέβειν τὸν Ἄρεα, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὠνόμασεν. *Onomast.* comp. Mov. i. p. q. p. 334.

[3] On this Movers i. p. q. mainly founds his view of the fire-nature of this god, which he then supports by Is. xxix. 1, 2, 7, where אֲרִיאֵל must denote Jerusalem as the hearth of God, as Hitzig, Ewald on the passage, and Steudel, Theol. d. A. T. p. 489, also teach; but Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 698 ff. has here also defended the correct explanation. And the derivation of the name from כמשׁ = כבשׁ, which is never used of fire, while it is approved even by Movers, p. 337, is very unsuitable to the fire-nature of Camos.

sented on the coins of Areopolis, standing on a pillar, holding in the right hand the sword, in the left a spear and shield, with two burning torches beside him (comp. Eckhel, *doctr. num. vet. tom.* iii. p. 504.) His name also points to this, כְּמוֹשׁ *subactor, domitor,* from כָּמַשׁ equal to כָּבַשׁ by a change of the labials מ and ב, which are often confounded with one another, comp. Gesen. *thes.* ii. p. 639.[1]

V. 6. מִלֵּא אַחֲרֵי יְהוָֹה a pregnant phrase taken from Deut. i. 36, xiv. 24, xxxii. 11 f., for מִלֵּא לָלֶכֶת אַ׳ י׳, to follow the Lord fully.—In v. 8 burning incense is mentioned before sacrifice, because it so far holds the first place in idolatry, that burning incense to the gods is often used for worshipping them, 2 Ki. xxii. 17, xxiii. 5, etc. "It agrees," as Bähr, Symbol. ii. p. 237 f. rightly remarks, "with the fundamental notion of the worship of nature, that here vegetable offerings, especially the burning of incense, occur in excess and much oftener than in other modes of worship, stand parallel with the bloody offerings, nay in some cases have even supplanted them." Incense only was burned on the altars of the celestial goddess at Paphos (Münter, der Temp. d. h. Gättin zu Paph. p. 20 f.)

Vv. 9, 10. By his fall Solomon brought the anger of the Lord upon him, who had appeared to him twice (iii. 5, and ix. 2) and warned him. *Εἰς ἐπίτασιν δὲ κατηγορίας τῆς θείας αποκαλύψεως, τῆς δὶς γενομένης ἐμνήσθη. οὐδὲ γὰρ δι' ἄλλου προφήτου, φησὶ, τὸ πρακτέον αὐτῳ ὑπέδειξεν· ἀλλ' αὐτὸς αὐτῷ πρὸ πάντων ἀπηγόρευσε τῶν ψευδωνύμων θεῶν τὴν λατρείαν· εἶτα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους νόμους φυλάττειν ἐκέλευσεν.* Thedoret.

Vv. 11—13. In the Divine sentence, which was probably announced to Solomon by a prophet, perhaps Ahijah (v. 29), Theodoret has pointed to the Divine goodness (*δείκνυσι τὴν ἄμετρον ἀγαθότητα*), which manifests itself in this, that the announced separation of the kingdom *(a)* occurs not in Solomon's life-time, but only after his death, and *(b)* the separation also is to be no entire rending away of the whole kingdom, but one tribe is to remain to his son. But this is done, not from respect

[1] On the older attempts at explaining the word כְּמוֹשׁ comp. *Dithm. Hackmann, de Cemoscho Moabitarum idolo* in J. Oelrichs *collectio hist. phil. theol.* i. 1, p. 19 ff.

to Solomon, who forfeited the Divine grace by his idolatry, but only on account of David and of Jerusalem, which he had chosen (v. 13), that is, not from a partial preference of David and Jerusalem, but in order that the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii.) and the choice of Jerusalem connected with this promise, as the place of the manifestation of his name, may remain unchangeable as an act of grace, which no sin of man can reverse (v. 36.)—"One tribe will I give to thy son." According to vv. 13 and 35, xii. 20 f., ten tribes are separated from the house of David, and besides Judah Benjamin also remains to him. Yet it is constantly said, that only one tribe remained to the house of David, and ten tribes fell away. This difficulty cannot, with C. a Lap., J. D. Mich., and others, be solved by understanding the one tribe to be Benjamin, as one tribe beside Judah. For the head-tribe, which formed the substance of the kingdom, and so far surpassed the state of Benjamin in compass, magnitude, and population, that the whole kingdom was named after it, could not possibly be unmentioned. Not more satisfactory is the expedient of Seb. Schm.: *dicit unam tribum, quia duarum istarum tribuum haereditas mixta fere erat et Hierosolymis una habitabant*, to which Cler., Schulz, and others assent. For the prophet Ahijah rends, v. 31, in order to symbolize the separation, his mantle into twelve pieces, and gives Jeroboam ten, with the words: ten tribes will the Lord give to thee, but the one tribe shall belong to him (Rehoboam.) But here we should expect: two tribes shall remain to him, as the prophet retained two pieces of his mantle. Besides Jeroboam properly received only nine tribes, as the tribe of Simeon, who received his portion of land within the inheritance of the children of Judah (Jos. xix. 1—9), lay altogether within the territory of Judah, so that it could not possibly be incorporated with the kingdom of Israel.[1] We must

[1] With this agree Rosenm. (bibl. Althk. II. i. p. 306 f.) and de Wette (Archæol. § 139.) On the contrary Winer (bibl. R.W., i. p. 738) explains, that not the whole tribe, but only some towns of Simeon, as also 2 Chr. xi. 10, the Danite towns Zorah and Aijalon, fell to the kingdom of Judah, with the appended remark, that even before the division of the kingdom several modifications in the territorial relations of the tribes might have taken place. Such modifications are certainly now and then introduced. Hence probably it is to be explained, that the towns Bethel (xii. 29), and Jericho (xvi. 34) lying within the bor-

therefore explain the constant mention of ten tribes and one tribe (Judah) from the symbolical import of the two numbers. That ten tribes fall away, is designed, as ten signifies totality, comp. Bähr, Symb. i. p. 175, to indicate that all Israel fell away from the house of David, as is also asserted, xii. 20. One tribe remains to him, that is, of the Divine grace only a single part of the sovereignty over all Israel is left to him. This view is confirmed by the observation, that even the standing distribution in the Old Testament of Israel into twelve tribes has its most proper ground not in the fact that Jacob had exactly twelve sons, as after the recognition of Ephraim and Manasseh as separate tribes, the people properly formed thirteen tribes, but is to be sought in the import which this number had acquired in the remotest antiquity by the observation of the twelve months of the year and the twelve signs of the Zodiac, comp. Hengstenb. die Gesh. Bil. p. 72.

V. 14 ff. Even if Solomon was not to lose any part of the kingdom, yet he was, during his life time, to suffer punishment for his idolatry through several adversaries, who endangered the

ders of Ephraim, but assigned to Benjamin, fell to the kingdom of Israel, that Ziklag, belonging to Simeon, was in David's time incorporated with the tribe of Judah, because the Philistine king Achish presented it to David (1 Sam. xxvii. 6); Zorah and Aijalon also may have belonged to the tribe of Judah before the division of the kingdom, where, however, it is to be remembered, that Aijalon being transferred to the Levites, was never actually in possession of the Danites, and the strongest party of the inhabitants of Zorah emigrated in the time of the Judges to Laish in the north of Palestine (Judg. xviii.); but such assumptions do not apply in the case of the tribe of Simeon, because the whole territory allotted to them by Joshua, lying within that of Judah, was surrounded by it, so that the Simeonites must have emigrated, if they wished to attach themselves to the kingdom of Israel. Now 1 Chr. iv. 31, 39—53 certainly points to wanderings and territorial changes of the Simeonites, but yet no emigration is mentioned on the division of the kingdom, which would entitle us to such an assumption. For the statement, 2 Chr. xv. 9, "Asa gathered all Judah and Benjamin וְהַגָּרִים עִמָּהֶם out of Ephraim, Manasseh, and *Simeon*, for many fell to him out of Israel" does not necessarily presuppose that the Simeonites actually belonged to the kingdom of Israel, for they were גָּרִים, because on the one hand they had their residence within the territory of Judah, and on the other belonged in idea, even if never in reality, to the ten tribes. Herewith comp. also the remarks on xii. 17.

peace of his kingdom, and must have constantly reminded him that he owed the quiet possession of the throne, as well as the peaceful sovereignty of the whole kingdom inherited from his father, only to the grace, truth, and long-suffering of the Lord.

Vv. 14—22. The first of these adversaries was the Edomite Hadad or Adad (v. 17) of the royal race, who, when a boy in the slaughter which Joab, in the time of David, caused among the Edomites after their conquest, was saved, found favour in Egypt, was afterwards married to the sister of Pharoah's wife, and on the death of David and Joab returned to his native land. Our narrative furnishes a supplement, certainly not quite free from obscurities, to the very brief account, 2 Sam. viii. 13 f.; 1 Chr. xviii. 12 f., of the subjugation of the Edomites by David. V. 15. בִּהְיוֹת אֶת־אֱדוֹם, "when he was with Edom," that is, met him (in a hostile manner.) The connection of the *præp.* אֵת with הָיָה is explained by the phrase, to wage war with (אֵת) one, Gen. xiv. 9; Num. xx. 13, etc., so that there is no occasion for the emendation proposed by Maur., since the old expositors, to whom he refers, have possibly only given the sense.—עָלָה־בֶעָלוֹת denotes either the advance of the army (xv. 17, xx. 22, Is. vii. 1, etc.) or is explained by the mountainous character of Idumæa. "To bury the slain." By the slain cannot be understood the slain Edomites (*C. a Lap.*), but only the Israelites who fell in the battle given to the Edomites in the valley of Salt, *sepulturae enim Idumæorum magnam curam non gerebat. Cler.* As according to 1 Chr. xviii. 12 Abishai led the Israelites in this battle, we must imagine the progress of affairs so, that after this defeat, in which, as 18,000 Edomites fell, the Israelites must have lost not a few men, Joab with fresh troops marched into the country to inter the slain Israelites and complete the subjugation of Edom, for which purpose he remained in the country six months with the whole army and cut off every male (v. 16), J. J. Hess, Gesch. Dav. i. p. 373 f.—כָּל־זָכָר denotes all men bearing or able to bear arms, all the valiant, that might have rebelled, for *Hadadus et alii aufugerunt, nec gens Idumæa extincta est. Cler.*—V. 17 f. The young prince Hadad fled with some servants of his father, first to Midian, then to Paran. The situation of Midian cannot be exactly

determined. A branch of the Midianites had their residence in the neighbourhood of the Moabites eastward from Edom to the eastern shore of the Aelanitic gulf; the other within the Arabian peninsula between Egypt and Mount Sinai, comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. iii. p. 95 f., Gesen. *thes.* i. 336 f. and Winer, bibl. R.W. ii. p. 111 f. Here the district inhabited by the latter is certainly meant. Paran, commonly called the wilderness of Paran, borders on the east on Edom, on the north on the south extremity of Palestine, and is the most northern district of the Sinaitic peninsula, the wilderness lying between Idumaea and Egypt, in which lay, Num. xiii. 26, Kadesh,[1] comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 139 ff. 171 f.

V. 18. From Paran they took men with them, probably as guides through the wilderness, and came to Egypt, where Pharaoh welcomed the son of the Edomite king, gave him a house, appointed him maintenance, and allotted him land, probably to be cultivated for the subsistence of the fugitives who came with him, but not for the pasture of their flocks, as Schulz and Deres infer from this, that the Edomites were a pastoral people; for these fugitives would scarcely bring herds with them. Hadad also remained at the royal court, and (v. 19) gained such favour with Pharoah, that he gave him the sister of the queen (הַגְּבִירָה) his wife in marriage, who bare him a son, who was weaned in Pharaoh's house. V. 20. The weaning, which probably, as among the Hebrews (Gen. xxi. 8) and other ancient nations (comp. *Dougtaei anal.* i. 22 f.) was accompanied with a banquet, took place in the royal palace, because the child was thereby admitted among the royal children to be educated with them. Vv. 21, 22. As soon as Hadad receives intelligence of the death of David and Joab, he asks leave of Pharaoh to return to his country, and obtains it after a vain attempt of Pharaoh to dis-

[1] Paran is erroneously identified by Niebuhr (Reise in Arab. i. p. 240 f.), Rosenm. (bibl. Althk. iii. p. 106), and v. Raumer (Zug d. Israel. p. 38), with the Wady Feiran in the neighbourhood of Sinai, where in the first century of the Christian era a town existed with a Bishop's See (comp. Rob. Pal. i. p. 207 f. 428.) See on the contrary Ranke, Untersuch. ü. d. Pentat. ii. p. 199 f. Winer is also in error, when he would recover (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 289) the biblical Paran in the *oppidum Pharan* mentioned by *Euseb.* and *Hieron.* situated three days' journey east of *Aelana*, comp. on the contrary Ges. *thes.* ii. 1090.

suade him from his purpose. The words of Pharaoh, "what hast thou lacked with me," are the language of pure love and attachment to Hadad, and involve the request to remain. This explains the answer, "No, but let me go." That the permission was granted, which follows from v. 25, must here be supplied by the reader. Thus Hadad returned to his native land, not because in consequence of the affinity of Solomon with Pharaoh he hoped to be able to reign meanwhile as Solomon's vassal, until he should feel himself strong enough to cast off the yoke of the Israelites (Deres.), but because after the death of the subjugator of his country he no longer feared for the safety of his life, and might already cherish plans for its deliverance. What he undertook against Solomon is not recorded. According to Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 7, 6) he should have incited Idumaea to revolt against Solomon, and, when this did not succeed, joined himself to Rezon, and become king of Syria; but C. a Lap. observes, that this statement contradicts the Bible text, and Josephus has only compiled it after the defective rendering of the LXX.[1]

Vv. 23—25. A second adversary of Solomon was Rezon the son of Eliadah, who was in the service of Hadadezer king of Zobah, but fled from him, and became captain of a band, that gathered round him, when David completely routed the Syrians, 2 Sam. viii. 3, 4. Rezon probably fled from his master, when he was engaged in war with David, and escaped in this way with the band gathered around him in the complete overthrow of his master to the west, so that this band might afterwards go to Damascus, and reign there (יִמְלְכוּ.) The occupation of Damascus took place only towards the end of David's reign, if not after his death, at all events immediately in the beginning of that of Solomon, as Rezon was an adversary to him (כָּל־יְמֵי

[1] We are not entitled even to the assumption of Winer in the bibl.. R.W. i. p. 346, that he effected a rebellion, but only partial and without permanent results; from vv. 14, 15, it can only be inferred, that he was occupied with plans of rebellion, so that Solomon had constantly to fear him as an adversary, who would seize the first fitting opportunity to wrest Edom from him. But his plans appear not to have been carried into execution, as Edom was dependent on the kingdom of Judah long after the death of Solomon, 1 Ki. xxii. 48 f. Hengstenb. Beitr. iii., p. 288 f.

(שְׁלֹמֹה) during his whole reign.[1]—וַיָּקָץ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל he abhorred Israel, that is, was wearied of the Israelitish sovereignty (comp. on קוּץ Hengstenb., die Gesch. Bil. p. 30 f.) and set up to be King of Aram (Syria.)—וְאֶת־הָרָעָה וגו׳, and indeed along with the evil, that Hadad did; comp. ואת v. 1.

Vv. 26—40. Hadad and Rezon are described only as שָׂטָן adversaries of Solomon; of the Ephraimite (comp. אֶפְרָתִי 1 Sam. i. 1; Judg. xii. 5) Jeroboam the son of Nebat, of Zereda or Zarthan (comp. vii. 46), Solomon's servant, it is said on the con-

[1] The view above given of vv. 23, 24, which are obscure on account of their brevity, corresponds perfectly with the words of the text, and does not require either the violent expedient of J. B. Köhler in Eichhorn's Repert. ii. p. 262 ff., who explains these verses as a gloss afterwards introduced into the text, or even the emendations he has proposed. The LXX., who have inserted the account of Rezon in v. 14, and make Hadad and Rezon to rebel jointly against Solomon, can give no valid authority for this, as it is evident that these translators have been led to their arbitrary alteration and mutilation of the text only by a misunderstanding of the words ואת־הרעה אשר הדד, v. 25. Had the old theologians considered this, they would not on the ground of the LXX., and of Josephus arbitrarily expounding the LXX. (*Antiq.* viii. 7—6) have formed conclusions, which obscured rather than explained the matter, comp. *des Vignoles*, *Chronol.* ii., p. 97 f.—Not less arbitrary is the alteration of the name *Rezon*, proposed by Köhler and adopted by Dathe, into Hezion, as the grandfather of Benhadad of Syria is called (xv. 18); for it is false, that the old versions confirm this rendering; LXX., *Chald.* and *Vulg.* agree quite with the Hebrew; the Syr. and the Arab. dependent on it certainly render רְזוֹן by ܗܕܪܘܢ, هدرون (*Hedrun*), but in xv. 18 they have also ܚܙܝܘܢ, حزيون (*chezion)*, as the Hebrew text, so that the two names are not identified.—But whether Rezon was only another name for Hezion (*Marsham*, *Can. chron.* p. 346) or Hezion the successor of Rezon, can neither be affirmed nor denied, because all accounts fail us, and hence Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 287, propounds the latter opinion, whereas ii. p. 381 he explains the former as probable.—If the account communicated by Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 2) from the 4th book of *Nicolaus Damascenus*, that the King of Damascus subdued by David, whose name 2 Sam. viii. 5 f.; 1 Chr. xviii. 5 f. is not given, was called Hadad (Ἄδαδος), and his descendants through ten generations held the throne of Damascus, possess historical credit, Rezon cannot be the same with Hezion, but must be regarded with *des Vignoles l.c.* as a usurper. But the historical credibility of this account is liable to many doubts, the discussion of which, however, does not belong to this place.

trary: "he lifted up his hand against the king," that is, raised a sedition or rebelled (הֵרִים יָד בְּ׳ is equivalent to נָשָׂא יָד בְּ׳ 2 Sam. xviii. 28, xx. 21.) The particular circumstances of this revolt are not mentioned, but only implied, v. 27 f.—In the building of Millo, and the walls of Jerusalem (ix. 15) Jeroboam distinguished himself as an able man (גִּבּוֹר חַיִל); wherefore Solomon set him over all the burdens of the house of Joseph, that is, charged him with the oversight of the burdens to be borne by the tribe of Ephraim in this building. In this position he must have raised a sedition, for his situation as overseer of these works is mentioned as the occasion (הַדָּבָר, v. 27) of the lifting up of his hand against the king. The particulars may be gathered from the grievances, of which the ten tribes complained at Shechem before Rehoboam in the government of Solomon, xii. 4.—V. 29. בָּעֵת הַהִיא at that time, that is, either when Jeroboam was overseer, or when he had raised the sedition. For the latter alternative it might be alleged, that it is more natural to connect the וַיְהִי, v. 29, with the principal sentence in v. 26, than with the explanatory collateral thoughts, in vv. 27 and 28. But on closely examining the whole section, it appears that וַיְבַקֵּשׁ, v. 40, is connected with וַיָּרֶם יָד בַּמֶּלֶךְ, v. 26 and vv. 27—39, therefore form a large explanatory parenthesis, in which case וַיְהִי, v. 29. can only refer to וַיַּפְקֵד, v. 28. But thence it follows, that Jeroboam only raised the sedition, after the prophet Ahijah had announced to him, that after Solomon's death he would receive the sovereignty of ten tribes. But thereby the proceeding of Jeroboam is neither warranted nor even excused. For first Ahijah expressly announced to him, that the Lord intended to let Solomon remain king during his life, and not to take the sovereignty out of his hand (v. 34), whereby every pretext for rebellion was taken from Jeroboam; next the prophetic announcement, that the Lord would make him king over ten tribes, even if the above clause had not been added, still gave him no right by a self-devised attempt at rebellion to wrest to himself the sovereignty, which God intended to give him. How he ought to conduct himself, if he wished not to consult his own ambition, but to follow the will of the Lord, he might have learned from

David, who in human judgment had much more reason to rebel against Saul and yet did it not. For not only was the rejection of Saul made known to him, but he was anointed king over Israel by the prophet Samuel, and was even obliged very soon to bear the consequences of Saul's rejection in the most sensible manner, and to suffer many years' flight and repeated hazard of life; yet he did not venture, when his persecutor and mortal foe was twice given into his power, so that he might have put him to death, to lay hand on "the Lord's anointed," and thereby put an end to his own sufferings, but endured patiently every hardship with pious resignation to the guidance of the Lord, of whom he knew that he had the power to accomplish his word, whenever it was agreeable to his holy will. In contrast with this conduct of David, the behaviour of Jeroboam appears as the most criminal rebellion, whereby Solomon was fully warranted to put him to death, had he not escaped his hands by his flight into Egypt (v. 40), whereas Saul had no just reason for attempting the life of David.

Vv. 29—31. In order to give still more weight to his announcement, the prophet Ahijah of Shiloh (now Seilun, comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 302 ff.), discharges his commission to Jeroboam by a symbolical action followed by an explanatory statement, as the prophets were often accustomed to do, comp. Köster, die Proph. des A. u. N. T. p. 262 f.—The new upper garment (שַׂלְמָה) was probably, as the *Heik* of the Arabs (see the illustration in Niebuhr's Reisebeschr. i., p. 196, plate 29, and Faber, in Harmar's Beobacht. ii., p. 407), only a large square of cloth, which by day was cast over the shoulders covering almost the whole body, and by night was used for a coverlet. *Nova vestis fuisse dicitur ob factum sequens, ut intelligatur propheta non temere fecisse quod fecit. Cler.* On vv. 32 and 33 comp. the remark on vv. 11—13. —For the form צִדֹנִין comp. Gesen. Hebr. Gramm. § 86, 1 *a*.

Vv. 34—36 append to v. 32 the precise determination, that Solomon shall remain prince during life, and the separation of the ten tribes from his kingdom take place only under his son, both from regard to David, who was chosen to be prince and kept the commandments of God. For his sake also Solomon's son is to retain one tribe, that David may have a light alway

before the Lord in Jerusalem the chosen city, that is, that he may never fail in a successor to the throne in Jerusalem. The promise, that a light should remain to David, which is repeated xv. 4; 2 Ki. viii. 19; 2 Chr. xxi. 7, is explained by 2 Sam. xxi. 17, where David is called the light of Israel, which he was only through the Lord (Ps. cxxxii. 17), inasmuch as God himself was his light (2 Sam. xxii. 29), or, as it is in the parallel passage Ps. xviii. 29, the Lord had made his light clear and his darkness light, that is, had raised him from a state of humility and poverty to high honour and great prosperity, comp. Hengstenb. Psalmencomm. on the passage; for the lighting of the light is a figure of prosperity, as the extinguishing of it is a figure of adversity, Job xviii. 5, 6; Prov. xx. 20, etc.[1]

Vv. 37—39. The condition on which Jeroboam's prosperity is to rest is the same under which the continuance of his sovereignty was promised to Solomon also (iii. 14, vi. 12, ix. 4), namely true obedience to the commandments of God and upright walking in the ways of the Lord. Only on this condition will the Lord build him a sure, perpetually enduring house, that is, ensure the perpetuity of his family[2] (comp. on בָּנָה בַּיִת לְ Gesen. *thes.* i. 215), as he promised to David, whose seed is now to be degraded on account of Solomon's idolatry, but not for ever (לֹא כָל־הַיָּמִים v. 39), because the Lord has announced to him the perpetual continuance of his seed and kingdom.—Jeroboam did not fulfil this condition, and therefore his house was extirpated under his son, xv. 28 f.

[1] Hitzig (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1835 Febr. p. 131) without right wishes to claim for the word נִיר, in the passages collectively cited above, the meaning, *novale*, which the phrase נִיר נִיר *novellare novale*, s. *agrum* Hos. x. 12, Jer. iv. 3 has: "Jehovah promises David the fallow land of his children alway, that is, the ever renewed issue of one generation from another without ceasing." For נִיר moorland, arable land cannot possibly signify a newly issuing generation. The scruple, however, that a light is elsewhere usually called נֵר is removed by the forms נִר Prov. xxi. 4 and נֵיר 2 Sam. xxii. 29, which prove the identity of נִיר and נֵר.

[2] Not the continued duration of the מַמְלָכָה, which was ensured to David along with the בַּיִת, 2 Sam. vii. 16.

Vv. 41—43. Close of the history of Solomon. Reference to the sources, in which more concerning it may be found, comp. Introd.—Length of his reign, death, burial, and successor. On the question largely discussed by the old interpreters, C. a Lap., S. Schm., Calm., and others, whether Solomon was saved or not, comp. *Pfeifferi dub. vex.* p. 435 and *Buddei hist. eccles.* ii. p. 273 ff. From the Scripture his conversion before his death cannot be proved, though we have no right therefore to condemn him.

# SECTION SECOND.

## HISTORY OF THE SEPARATED KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH TILL THE FALL OF THE FORMER.

The period in which the covenant people form two kingdoms standing side by side, falls into three epochs, which are clearly distinguished from one another in a religious and political respect. The first epoch comprises the interval from the separation of the two kingdoms to the beginning of Ahab's reign and the 38th year of the reign of Asa king of Judah, chap. xii.—xvi. The separate kingdoms stand in hostility to each other until it comes to an open and general war, which ends in a great defeat of Israel, while the hostile position of the two kingdoms is not changed. In a religious point of view the calf-worship introduced by Jeroboam is continued without interruption; in Judah the legal worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem has to contend at first with the Canaanitish idolatry, until the latter is exterminated by Asa.—The second epoch extends from Ahab in Israel and Jehoshaphat in Judah to the deaths of Joram, king of Israel, and Ahaziah, king of Judah, effected by Jehu chap. xvii.—2 Ki. x. During this period, very brief in its compass, but of vast importance for the internal history of the theocracy, Israel has to contend constantly with the Syrians, while at home the worship of Baal prevails: it is on friendly terms with Judah, so that the two royal houses form a matrimonial alliance, by which Judah is not only involved in the political strife of Israel with the Syrians, but also drawn into the Phœnician worship of Baal.—In the

third epoch finally (from 2 Ki. xi.—xvii.) the two kingdoms after they have recovered from the wounds inflicted by the worship of Baal and the Syrians, enter again into hostilities with one another. In consequence of this hostile feeling through the untheocratic policy of the ungodly Ahaz, the way is opened for the Assyrians into Canaan, who after repeated invasions overturn the kingdom of Israel, which had given up the service of Baal certainly, but not that of the calves, and bring even Judah, where the Levitical temple-worship continued to prevail till the time of Jotham, though under Ahaz idolatry of every kind was fostered and indulged, to the brink of ruin.

Among the most difficult parts of this portion of the history of the covenant people is the chronological computation of this period in whole and in part. As in our books not only the length of the reign of each king of Israel and Judah is given, but also each commencement of the reign of an Israelitish king is determined according to the year of the reign of the contemporary Jewish king and inversely; we obtain by these different statements a check certainly for the more exact fixing of the chronological dates, but this again is rendered extremely difficult by the fact that the sum of the years of the reign of several kings is commonly greater than they can have reigned according to the synchronistic statements of the contemporary sovereigns in the other kingdom. Chronologists have therefore at all times endeavoured to reconcile these diverging chronological data by means of the hypothesis of inexact statements of co-regencies and *interregna*.[1] But these hypotheses remain merely an arbitrary expedient as long as their necessity is not exhibited, and at the sametime a fixed principle for their application pointed out. Their necessity certainly follows with almost demonstrative certainty from the biblical text, inasmuch as without them the different numbers of years are absolutely irreconcilable; the principle lying at the foundation of the diverging chronological statements of the text, on the contrary, we find nowhere pro-

[1] Ferd. Wilh. Beer (Vereinigung der Regierungsjahre, welche die heil. Schrift den Königen von Juda u. Israel beigelegt, Lpz. 1751) has besides had recourse to the altogether groundless hypothesis, that the years of the Israelitish kings were lunar, those of the Jewish solar.

pounded, and therefore also it has been discovered by few chronologists, and consistently carried out by none, on which account all chronological computations are destitute of the necessary certainty and consistency, and deviate very widely from one another in details.[1] We believe, however, that not only the length of this whole period and its chief epochs, but also the duration of the several reigns may be determined with tolerable certainty from the biblical statements, as these are by no means so inexact or arbitrary as many chronologists have asserted.[2]

[1] Thus, for example, the duration of the kingdom of Israel (or our period), according to F. W. Beer, amounted to 219 years; according to Marsham, 235 years; according to Lilienthal, 251; according to J. G. Frank (Astron. Grundrechnung der bibl. Gesch. Gottes, Winer (bibl. R.W. i. p. 730), and de Wette (Archæol. p. 43, 3d ed.), 255; according to Bengel *(ordo temp.)* and R. v. Chr. Bennigsen (bibl. Zeitrechn. 1778), 259; according to J. Nic. Tiele, 260; according to *des Vignoles*, 245; according to *Archinard*, 265; and according to Joach. Hartmann *(system. chronol. bibl. Rostoch.* 1777), 266 years. Comp. also Offerhaus *spicil. hist. chron.* (Gröning. 1739) p. 38 f., and *Gibert* Mém. sur la chronol. etc. in Mém. de l'acad. des in script. xxxi. 1 *sqq.*

[2] Thus, for example, J. Nic. Tiele, Chronologie des A. Test., Bremen 1839, p. 59 f., says: "The chronological statements are not given with arithmetical accuracy, but with the looseness, which is found in common life. As we hear one, who, for example, is 30 years and some months old, sometimes say, I am in my 30th year, sometimes more accurately, I am in the 31st year, so also in the Books of Kings the 17th year, or the year 17 of a king, may sometimes mean the time after he has reigned 17 years and upwards, sometimes more exactly the time from the 16th to the 17th year of his reign. In the statements of the reigns of the kings only full years are usually mentioned, while naturally they have not reigned quite full years. Here then occurs great inexactness in the statements of time. The supernumerary months are sometimes not included at all in the computation, sometimes they are reckoned for a full year; and hence there is no definite rule; but one time perhaps a few months are reckoned for a full year, another time a greater number is not reckoned at all, just as is usual with us in ordinary life when we state how old any one is. But this inaccuracy is carried still farther than it is wont to be with us. For sometimes the years of a king are so computed, that only the full years (from the first of Nisan to the last of Adar) are stated, and the months which he reigned before and after that date are not taken into account, even if they should together make up almost a year, or

We assume in the kingdom of Judah no *interregnum* at all, but merely a co-regency (that of Joram with his father Jehoshaphat) pretty clearly indicated in the text (2 Ki. viii. 16), and in the kingdom of Israel no co-regency, but only two *interregna* (the one after Jeroboam II., the other between Pekah and Hoshea), and reconcile the differences arising from the synchronistic determinations of time according to the principle already propounded in the Talmud, that the years of the kings were counted only from Nisan to Nisan, and in such a manner that even a single day before or after the first of Nisan was reckoned equal to a year.[1] On this principle, in accordance with which a reign, for example that of Baasha, which lasted only twenty-two years and some months, may be stated at twenty-four years, since, namely, it began not long before the Nisan of the year twenty-three from the separation of the kingdoms, and ended soon after that of the year forty-five, is based the following chronological table from our period :—

even more than a year; sometimes, on the contrary, these months on both sides are set down for a full year." But in this extended sense the asserted inaccuracy is an unfounded assumption.

[1] Compare *Gemara Bab. tractat.* ראש השנה *cap.* i. *fol.* 3, *p.* 1 *ed. Amstelod:* אין מונין להם למלכים אלא מניסן, "*non numerant in regibus nisi a Nisano*" *(i.e. regum annos non nisi a Nisano numerant)*; on this, after citing several authors in proof of it, אמר ר' חסדא לא שנו אלא למלכי ישראל "*dixit R. Chasda: hoc non docent nisi de regibus Israelitarum.*" *Ibid. fol.* 2. *p.* 2. ניסן ראש השנה למלכים ויום אחד בשנה חשוב שנה, "*Nisanus initium anni regibus, ac dies quidem unus in anno (videl. post calendas Nisani) instar anni computatur.*" *Ibid.* יום אחד בסוף שנה חשוב שנה, "*unus dies in fine anni pro anno computatur.*" With this comp. Wieseler, chronol. Synopse der vier Evang. Hamb. 1843, p. 52 ff., who has proved the existence of this mode of reckoning also in Josephus. In the New Testament also it is found, for example, in the statement that Jesus lay three days in the grave, and therefore cannot, with J. Hartmann i. p. q. p. 253 f., be represented as a mere invention of the Rabbins and later commentators, even if it were not carried out with the utmost consistency by the authors of the Bible, that a single day after Nisan or the beginning of the year was counted for a whole year, as appears to follow from 2 Ki. xv. 17 and 23.

| Year of the Separation. | Kingdom of Judah. | Years. | Year of Jewish Kings. | Kingdom of Israel. | Years. | Year of Israelitish Kings. | Year before Christ. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rehoboam reigned | 17 | 1st | Jeroboam reigned | 22 | 1st | 975 |
| 18 | Abijah ,, | 3 | | | | 18th | 957 |
| 20 | Asa ,, | 41 | | | | 20th | 955 |
| 2½ | | | 2d | Nadab ,, | 2 | | 95¼ |
| 23 | | | 3d | Baasha ,, | 24 | | 952 |
| 45 | | | 26th | Elah ,, | 2 | | 930 |
| 46 | | | 27th | Zimri, 7 days | | | 929 |
| 46 | | | 27th | Tibni and Omri ,, | 4 | | 929 |
| 50 | | | 31st | Omri alone ,, | 8 | 4th | 925 |
| 57 | | | 38th | Ahab ,, | 22 | | 918 |
| 61 | Jehoshaphat ,, | 25 | | | | 4th | 914 |
| 78 | | | 17th | Ahaziah ,, | 2 | | 897 |
| 79 | | | 18th | Joram ,, | 12 | | 896 |
| 84 | Joram, co-regent | 2 | (23d) | | | 5th | 891 |
| 86 | Joram, alone ,, | 6 | | | | 7th | 889 |
| 91 | Ahaziah ,, | 1 | | | | 12th | 884 |
| 92 | Athaliah ,, | 6 | | Jehu ,, | 28 | | 883 |
| 98 | Joash ,, | 40 | | | | 7th | 877 |
| 119 | | | 22d ? | Jehoahaz ,, | 17 | | 856 |
| 135 | | | 37th | Joash ,, | 16 | | 840 |
| 137 | Amaziah ,, | 29 | | | | 2d | 838 |
| 151 | | | 15th | Jeroboam II. ,, | 41 | | 824 |
| 165 | Uzziah ,, | 52 | | | | 15th ? | 810 |
| 192 | | | (27th) | Anarchy ,, | 11½ | | 783 |
| 203 | | | 38th | Azariah, 6 ms. | | | 772 |
| 204 | | | 39th | Shallum 1 m. | | | 771 |
| 204 | | | 39th | Menahem ,, | 10 | | 771 |
| 215 | | | 50th | Pekahiah ,, | 2 | | 760 |
| 216 | | | 52d | Pekah ,, | 20 | | 759 |
| 217 | Jotham ,, | 16 | | | | 2d | 758 |
| 233 | Ahaz ,, | 16 | | | | 17th | 742 |
| 236 | | | 4th | Anarchy ,, | 8½ | | 739 |
| 245 | | | 12th | Hoshea ,, | 9 | | 730 |
| 248 | Hezekiah ,, | 29 | | | | 3d | 727 |
| 25¾ | | | 6th | Fall of Kingdom | | | 72¼ |

This table corresponds in the determination of the length of this period with the usual assumption[1] as to the beginning and end of the kingdom of the ten tribes, but deviates from it in some details of the intervening determinations of years, as the retrenchment of the years of the reigns of the kings of Israel and

[1] Which has passed over from *Usserii annales Vet. et Novi Test.* into most compends of biblical history, and which, among others, Jahn, bibl. Archæol. ii. 1, p. 159, and de Wette, in the second edition of his hebr. jüd. Archæol. have followed, though the latter for two very insufficient reasons assigned against it by Winer (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 730 f.) has again departed from it.

Judah stated in whole numbers according to the above-mentioned principle, has been attempted to be carried out consistently with the closest possible adherence to the synchronistic statements of the text.[1]—The years B.C. annexed to the table rest on the one hand on this, that the end of the seventy years' Babylonish captivity of the Jews, which occurred in the first year of the sole sovereignty of Cyrus over the Medo-Babylonian empire, falls in the year 536 B.C.,[2] on the other hand, on the common assumption that from the fall of the kingdom of Israel to the destruction of Jerusalem in the 11th year of Zedekiah 133—134 years elapsed, which number is obtained by the simple addition of the years in the reigns of the Jewish kings during this period. But as we are fully entitled, according to the principle followed by the author of the Books of Kings in this period, to the presumption that the years of the sovereigns of Judah after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, being given in whole numbers, were not always complete, this last period of the kingdom of Judah will have been in reality perhaps two or three years shorter than it is usually reckoned, according to which all the different chronological data must be set back by the same period. But as in the utter absence of accurate synchronistic statements of time in other nations or kingdoms, every standard for this reduction fails us, it seems advisable, in order to avoid anything arbitrary, to abide by the assumption founded on the simple biblical numbers.

[1] The table deviates from them only in two points, to wit, the beginning of the reign of Jehoahaz of Israel is placed in the twenty-second, not as in 2 Ki. xiii. 1 the twenty-third, year of Jehoash of Judah, and that of Uzziah or Azariah of Judah in the fifteenth, not as in 2 Ki. xv. 1 the twenty-seventh, year of Jeroboam of Israel, the reasons for which will be unfolded in their proper places.

[2] This, which is the prevalent view, we ground on the fact, that the seventy years' Babylonish captivity of the Jews (Jer. xxv. 11) begins with the fourth year of Jehoiakim, in which Nebuchadnezzar, and, indeed, according to Berosus, still in the life time of his father Nabopolassar, smote the Egyptians at Circesium on the Euphrates (Jer. xlvi. 2); but this fourth year of Jehoiakim coincides with the twenty-first of Nabopolassar, in whose fifth year an eclipse of the moon noted in the Almagest was observed, which, according to the computation of Ideler in the Abhandl. der Berl. Acad. 1814 f. histor. Kl. p. 202 and 224, occurred on the twenty-second of April 621 B.C. If this be correct, the twenty-first year of Nabopolassar coincides with 606 B.C., and the Babylonish captivity of the Jews began 606 B.C., and ended 536 B.C.

*First epoch;* from the division of the kingdom to Ahab of Israel and Asa of Judah. This space of 57 years begins with the revolt of the ten tribes from the house of David, and the foundation of the kingdom of Israel by Jeroboam, and is completed in the kingdom of Israel by six sovereigns of four different families, and in that of Judah by the reigns of three kings.—After the account of the political and religious foundation of the kingdom of the ten tribes (ch. xii.) follows the prophecy *(a)* concerning the bull or calf worship introduced by Jeroboam (ch. xiii.), *(b)* concerning the house of Jeroboam and his dynasty (ch. xiv. 1—19.) Then are given the most important circumstances in the reigns of the Jewish kings Rehoboam, Ahijah, and Asa (ch. xiv. 20, xv. 24), on which finally the history of Israel from the accession of Nadab to the death of Omri (ch. xv. 25, xvi. 28), is summarily stated.

## CHAPTER XII.

REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES FROM THE HOUSE OF DAVID, VV. 1—24, COMP. 2 CHR. X.—XI. 4; FOUNDATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL, VV. 25—33.

After J. D. Michaelis had attempted,[1] if not quite to justify, yet as far as possible to excuse the revolt of the ten tribes from the royal house of David, de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 129) comes forward with the assertion: "according to 1 Ki. xii.

[1] In the Mos. Recht. i. § 55 Mich. finds in the narrative of our chapter nothing but "an electoral contract of a people exercising their freedom." But what Mich. here adduces to prove, that the Israelitish kings were restricted on the part of the people by terms of election, rests upon modern theories of constitutional governments of which the Bible knows nothing. For the covenant, which David (2 Sam. v. 6) concludes before the Lord with the tribes on their doing homage to him, is as far from a contract of election, in which limitations of the royal power were imposed on the king by the people, as the covenant which Jehoiada the high priest (2 Ki. xi. 17) at the anointing of King Jehoash made with Jehovah, the king and the people.

these tribes acted with perfect propriety, they made just and fair demands, and the blame could be attributed only to the imprudence of Rehoboam." How far this assertion boldly contravenes all history has been already shown in my apolog. Vers. p. 445 ff. The separation of these tribes from the sovereignty of the royal family of David was certainly determined of God for Israel as a punishment for the idolatry of Solomon, and it was not only predicted in general terms by the prophet Ahijah, but the sovereignty over it was also promised to Jeroboam; but neither the conduct of these tribes is thereby justified, nor the way and manner in which Jeroboam violently seized upon the sovereignty, which the Lord designed to give him. But why did the tribes send to Egypt to bring back Jeroboam, who had already rebelled against Solomon, but because they were previously meditating plans of rebellion, for the execution of which Jeroboam seemed to them to be the proper man. That they altogether selfishly effected the separation designed of God, and thereby made it a criminal revolt, is shown by the whole progress of the affair, as it is described in our chapter.

V. 1. In order to receive the homage of the ten tribes, who under the influence of the powerful tribes of Ephraim were long since jealous of Judah,[1] Rehoboam proceeded to Shechem, where these tribes were assembled, in order, as it is said, לְהַמְלִיךְ אֹתוֹ, "to make him king." On a superficial view it might certainly appear, that these tribes here only "made use again of their old right of election" (Gramberg, Relig. id. ii. p. 162); but irrespective of this, that they actually had no unconditional free right of election, and, on the contrary, after the Lord had promised to the posterity of David the perpetual sovereignty, obedience to God demanded the willing recognition of the rightful heir to the throne, we have only impartially to compare our narrative with the homage described, 2 Sam., which all the tribes of Israel rendered to David at Hebron, to be convinced of this, that the definite intention to rebel lay at the foundation of the conduct of the ten tribes related in this passage. The tribes came to David at Hebron, his residence, and came with the con-

[1] Comp. *J. H. Verschuir, diss. de aemulatione Israelitarum mutua, tanquam vera causa scissæ ac debilitatae Judaeorum reipublicae,* printed in his *dissertationes* 1773. p. 66 f.

fession, "We are thy bone and thy flesh; Jehovah has said to thee, thou shalt feed my people Israel, and shalt be prince over Israel" (2 Sam. v. 1, 2.) Here, on the contrary, they come not to Jerusalem, where Rehoboam had ascended the throne, but assemble at Shechem, whither Rehoboam must come, and propose conditions to him, which he cannot accept without setting arbitrary limits to the royal prerogative. In the choice of Shechem as the place of doing homage Kimchi has already recognized the definite intention to revolt: *Quaesiverunt occasionem transferendi regni in Jarobeamum ideoque noluerunt venire Hierosolyma, sed venerunt Sichemum, quae est Ephraimi et Jarobeam fuit Ephraimita (cf. Not. in bibl. Hal. ed. J. H. Mich.)* Then (vv. 2, 3)[1] the whole affair of the return of Jeroboam from Egypt is effected, who is rightly characterized by H. Witsius, *Δεκαφυλον* p. 307, as *vir sagax, inquietus et dominandi avidus atque ab ineunte aetate iis eruditus artibus, quibus ingenia ad magnae fortunae cultum incitantur.* He it was also, who suggested to them their demand, v. 4. *Proculdubio iste praetextus populo a Jarobeamo fuit subministratus: qui cum prius fuisset praefectus operum super Ephraim, ex iis quae prae aliis noverat, potuit astutissime calumniari.* Seb. Schm.—v. 4. The tribes desire a lightening of the burdens, which Solomon had laid on them. Expositors are divided in opinion as to whether Solomon laid too heavy burdens on the people or not. The truth seems to lie in an intermediate view, as Ephraim Syr. has already shown. Solomon required of his people certainly greater ser-

[1] Regarding the construction of vv. 2 and 3 Seb. Schmidt observed, that the apodosis to וַיְהִי כִּשְׁמֹעַ only begins with וַיָּבֹאוּ v. 3 and the words from וְהוּא to וַיִּקְרְאוּ־לוֹ are a parenthesis. The difference also, that in our verse Jeroboam is recalled from Egypt, whereas in the parallel passage 2 Ch. x. 2 he himself came, and was then only invited to Shechem, he has thus satisfactorily explained: *Utrumque verum sed diversae sunt vocationes. Nam ubi Salomo mortuus est, miserunt fautores Jarobeami in Aegyptum et nuntiata Salomonis morte invitarunt ut ex Aegypto in patriam rediret; quod et fecit. Cumque conveniendum esset in Sichem, totus Israel decem tribuum misit ad ipsum, ut simul veniret, imo dux et consiliarius esset.* There is no necessity therefore for the change proposed by Dathe of וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּמִצְרָיִם into וַיָּשָׁב במצרים, which Maurer has with justice rejected.

vices than they were hitherto accustomed to render, partly to meet the expenses of his splendid court, partly to execute the numerous and extensive buildings undertaken by him. But on the other hand, the nation enjoyed under his sceptre not only an undisturbed peace with all its consequent blessings, but must have also attained to general prosperity through the wealth which flowed into the country from the trade carried on by him, and the large taxes of several tributary nations, so that there could be no reasonable occasion for any real complaint or grievance. But if men, as is often done, overlooked the advantages and blessings, which they owed to the government, and turned the eye solely to that which Solomon required for these, it might easily appear as if he had laid on the nation a heavy yoke, and a grievous service.

Vv. 5—15. In order to take the desire of the people into mature consideration, Rehoboam announces that he would give them an answer in three days, and lays the matter first before the older counsellors, who had served under Solomon, who advise him to yield at present to the will of the people, and give them good words, and they will serve him for ever (v. 7.) Not contented with this advice, Rehoboam submits the affair to the younger advisers, who had grown up with him, who decide for intimidating the people by severe threatening. V. 10. "My smallest limb is thicker than my father's loins." קָטָנִּי from קטן *parvitas, i.e. membrum minimum;* most expositors explain it after the *Vulg.* of the little finger, whereas LXX. and *Chald.* give the abstract *ἡ μικρότης*, חַלְשׁוּתִי *debilitas mea.* The phrase is a proverbial one in the sense: "I have much greater power than my father, I will lay on you a still heavier yoke." "My father hath chastised you with whips, I will chastise you with scorpions." עַקְרָב, scorpion—*flagelli genus globulis plumbeis cum aculeis incurvis munitum, a scorpii similitudine dictum (Ges. thes.* 11, 1062.)[1] This counsel was not only very imprudent *consideratis circumstantiis negotii* (Seb. Schm.), but in and of itself unwise and perverse. It was the speech of a despotic tyrant, not of a

[1] *Virga, si est nodosa vel aculeata, scorpio . . vocatur, quia arcuato vulnere in corpus infigitur. Isidor. Hispal. Orig. l. v. in Dougtaei anal. ss.* i. p. 175.

shepherd and ruler appointed by God over his people, which of necessity must issue in the revolt of the seditious tribes. This is also (v. 15) indicated by the remark, that Rehoboam did not follow the counsel of the old experienced advisers, but that of the young men, who had grown up with him, and therefore knew his haughty ambitious character and wished to flatter him.[1] But whether the advice of the old men would have had a favourable issue is certainly another question. Probably for the moment, but not for a continuance. For to become a עֶבֶד of the people, to serve the people the king was unable, without forgetting the right and power granted to him by God. Had he, however, agreed to such a concession, he would have taken from the tribes every pretext for separation, and had no share in the guilt of the revolt. But Rehoboam followed the haughty counsel of the young men, for it was סִבָּה מֵעִם יְהוָֹה "a turn from the Lord," that is, a dispensation of God, "that he might perform his saying," v. 15. Here the author points to the higher causality of the event. *Ipsa Rehabeami stolida imprudentia consilio Dei inservivit, ut quod accidit etiam merito accidisse videretur.* Wits. i. p. q. p. 308.

V. 16 f. The haughty and harsh answer of Rehoboam gives the discontented tribes apparently just cause for separation. With the answer: "What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse. To your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David," they returned to their homes. In these words, with which the Benjamite Sheba had proclaimed sedition and rebellion against David in the land (2 Sam. xx. 1), is expressed the deep-rooted aversion to the royal house of David so strongly, that it is manifest the revolt had a deeper cause than the pretended oppression of Solomon, since it had its proper ground only in the old jealousy of Judah, suppressed indeed under Solomon, but still not utterly extinguished, which resulted again from the untheocratic disposition of these

[1] *Juvenes nimirum existimabant indignum facinus esse Salomonis filio, Davidis nepoti, leges regnandi a populo Hebraeo imponi, majestatemque regiam viliorem posthac futuram nisi ab initio regni eam revereri adsuesceret populus.* Cler.

tribes, from their disloyalty to Jehovah.—V. 17 contains the important historical notice: "but the children of Israel, who dwelt in the cities of Judah, over them Rehoboam reigned." As in this chapter Israel always means the ten tribes (comp. vv. 1 3, 16, 18, 19, 20, etc.), by the Israelites dwelling in the cities of Judah are not to be understood members of the tribe of Judah, but only of the ten tribes. Hence the older expositors, for example Witsius i. p. q. p. 317, thought of the Simeonites, who from the situation of their territory (comp. on xi. 13) must have remained in the kingdom of Judah, and might have been designated Israelites dwelling in the cities of Judah, inasmuch as their whole territory was originally given to the tribe of Judah, of whom they afterwards received a portion, Jos. xix. 9. Moreover, some members of the other tribes may in the course of time have settled in the cities of Judah, who also remained under Rehoboam.

V. 18 f. In order to treat with the tribes, who were disaffected and complaining of too heavy burdens, and appease them, Rehoboam sends to them Adoram who was over the socagers (comp. iv. 6), who was the least adapted for such a commission. The result, therefore, of his mission is, that he is stoned to death, and Rehoboam is compelled to summon all his energies (הִתְאַמֵּץ) by speedy flight in his chariot to escape a similar fate. Thus the ten tribes revolted from the royal house of David and made Jeroboam their king, v. 19.

Vv. 20—24. That v. 20 begins like v. 2, Theodoret has remarked but incorrectly explained: *Δὶς μὲν τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ πολλάκις ἀναγκάζεται λέγειν· ἐπειδὴ περὶ δύο βασιλειῶν διῃρημένων συγγράφει· καὶ ἔστιν ὅτε πολλὰ περὶ θατέρας τιθεὶς διηγήματα, εἶτα εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν διαβαίνων ἀναγκάζεται ἀναλαβεῖν τὰ ἤδη προειρημένα, ὥστε τὴν ἀκολουθίαν φυλάξαι.* But here is no transition from the history of one kingdom to that of the other; the similar beginning of the two verses is much rather explained by this, that v. 20 concludes the narrative begun with v. 2. The following vv. 21—24 correspond to v. 1 of our chapter, and therefore belong to the first section of the chapter.—The revolt of the ten tribes is only completed when Rehoboam desists from his purpose to subdue them by force of war, after the prophet Shemaiah has

shown that the thing is from the Lord,[1] and in the name of the Lord forbidden the Jews to make war on their brethren. וַיָּשֻׁבוּ לָלֶכֶת "and returned to go," that is, they desisted from the intended war and returned to their homes; וַיָּשֻׁבוּ מִלֶּכֶת 2 Chr. xi. 4 is explanatory.

Vv. 25—33. *Founding of the kingdom of Israel.* After Jeroboam was made king, he built Shechem for his residence. This city (שְׁכֶם) situated on the mountains of Ephraim, between Mount Ebal and Gerizzim, mentioned even in the times of Abraham and Jacob, after the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites assigned to the tribe of Ephraim, but transferred to the Levites and declared a free city, where Joshua held his last imperial diet, was destroyed in the time of the Judges by Abimelech (comp. Rob. Pal. iii., p. 336 ff.), and therefore rebuilt by Jeroboam, and probably also fortified, but did not long remain a royal residence, as we find Jeroboam xiv. 17 residing in Tirzah. After the captivity Shechem became the capital of the Samaritans, who have there survived to the present day, and still exists as an inconsiderable town under the name *Nablus* or *Nabulus*, corrupted from *Flavia Neapolis*, comp. Rob. i. p. q. p. 315 ff. and von Raumer, Pal. p. 158 ff.—Moreover Jeroboam built, that is, fortified the city Penuel, beyond Jordan, north-east of Succoth (Jud. viii. 6—8), on the north side of the Jabbok (Wady Zerka), comp. von Raumer, p. 246, and Winer (bibl. R. W. ii., p. 314.)[2] This city had formerly a tower (castle), which Gideon destroyed (Judg. viii. 17.) Jeroboam therefore fortifies it for the security of his kingdom against the conquerors of Upper Asia, for as may be inferred from Gen. xxxii. 22 ff., and Judg. viii. 8 ff., it lay on the great caravan-road, which led over Gilead to Damascus and farther by Palmyra across the Euphrates to Mesopotamia.

Vv. 26—29. In order to secure permanence to the political

[1] הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה, Seb. Schm. correctly explains: *privatio regni super decem tribus, non autem rebellio earum.* Comp. remarks on v. 15.

[2] Not on the south side of the Jabbok, as Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 2 p. 31, assumes after Euseb. and Hieron. Tuch also, Comm. on Gen. p. 469, incorrectly remarks, that "the place must have been situated near the conflux of the Jabbok with the Jordan not far from Scythopolis."

separation, Jeroboam endeavours to provide his subjects with a substitute for the temple-worship at Jerusalem by the institution of the new *sacra*, that they might have no occasion to travel to Jerusalem to the feasts, from which he apprehended not without reason a return of the people to the house of David, and thence again danger to his own life. In this new arrangement the view of the narrative, according to which Jeroboam made all his arrangement with conscious intention, is regarded by Br. Bauer as improbable.[1] "For Jeroboam could not stand so exclusively above

[1] The Hegelian Vatke in his Relig. de. A. T. p. 398, goes much farther. With him the worship instituted by Jeroboam is neither an apostasy from the true service of Jehovah, because the two golden calves are symbolical representations of Jehovah, and as such had been already in use, and this image-worship was in fact (?) a refinement of an older form of worship, which had been still retained, nor an opposition to the Jewish temple-worship, for the family of Jeroboam was more truly devoted to the service of Jehovah than Solomon and his immediate successors; and the temple had not yet obtained universally the character of a central or national sanctuary, because otherwise Jeroboam could not have founded a similar temple in the kingdom of Israel. Jeroboam only sanctioned the sensual worship and fixed it for ages; which, however, must be regarded rather as the necessary consequence of the collective condition of the people, than the act and guilt of the individual, and in another respect again acted with beneficent effect, as the religion of Jehovah was generally preserved in Israel, etc. These assertions, drawn purely from the fancy, and in crying contradiction with the historical books and prophets of the Old Testament, Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 150 ff. has deemed worthy of a refutation so fundamental and complete, that we do not require to dwell upon them. There is no foundation for Vatke's assumption, that the worship of Jehovah under the symbols of bulls was in use at an earlier period. Except the golden calf, which Aaron cast for the people at Sinai, there is not a shadow of proof for it, comp. Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 151 f. Therewith falls at the same time the farther fiction of this critic, that this worship was an improvement of an older worship previously in use. But the no less unhistorical assertion, that Jeroboam's family was more truly devoted to the service of Jehovah than Solomon and his successors, is strikingly refuted on the one hand by Solomon's piety in the early part of his reign, which even in his subsequent declension so far held its ground, that he continued uninterrupted the legal worship of Jehovah in the temple along with the idolatry of his wives (comp. ix. 25), on the other hand by the narrative in ch. xiii. on which Vatke in vain endeavours to cast suspicion, comp. Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 166 ff. Finally, what Vatke dreams about the salutary effects of the calf-worship, has been long since corrected by history itself, which has actually shown that the kingdom of Israel had the germ of corruption in

and apart from the people in his plans, that from his own thoughts and deliberations, even if he had consulted with several, he should have given the people an entirely new form of religion, which had been hitherto quite foreign to them. The people could not have taken up so eagerly as they did, or followed so constantly and obstinately this new form, if they had not been already inclined to it, and if the basis of it had not been already laid in their life. Neither could he displace the priests of the tribe of Levi and the Levites in general, if there had not been always an aversion to them among the people" (Relig. des A. T. ii., p. 177 ff.) In this reasoning the true and the false are intermingled, as also in the conclusions drawn from it, that "the separation of the people into two parts was an act of the general consciousness, and Jeroboam only employed for this purpose the principles inherent in the popular mind." Certain principles tending to separation no doubt existed among the people in the above-mentioned old jealousy of Ephraim towards Judah, which again originated in the want of genuine loyalty towards the Lord and his law; but the religious institutions of Jeroboam are and continue to be his own work, which he devised with a party like-minded with himself and forced upon the people, for which reason also they encountered great opposition not only on the part of the priests and Levites, but also from a large section of the people, and many emigrated sooner than take part in this unlawful worship (2 Chr. xi. 16.) That this new form of religion was eagerly adopted by the people is a fancy of Bauer, which is contradicted by the history; but that, after it was forced upon the people, they firmly adhered to it, is explained by the spirit of opposition to Judah, which the despotism of Jeroboam and his successors was able to keep alive. This despotism, with which Jeroboam conducted himself, as founder and lord of the new worship, and not the aversion of the people to them, compelled the priests and Levites also to emigrate. For as he tolerated only his own worship in his kingdom, they were compelled, as with the Levitical temple-worship their income was withdrawn

it from the very beginning, and therefore also perished 134 years before the kingdom of Judah. The remaining fancies of our critic will be discussed underneath.

from them, to emigrate of necessity, even if they had not done so from opposition to Jeroboam's unlawful proceedings.

Thus Jeroboam caused two golden calves to be made, and the one to be set up at Bethel and the other at Dan. This measure J. D. Mich. (Mos. R. iv. p. 162 ff.) takes to be "very politic," but certainly contrary to the Divine law. The judgment of C. a Lap., however, was much more correct: *Videbatur hoc ejus consilium politice prudens et ad regnum suum statumque politicum tuendum salutare: sed re vera fuit imprudens et perniciosum statumque et regnum ejus prorsus labefactavit et evertit.* Only a short-sighted superficial policy can see high statesmanship in a measure arising from mere unbelief in the word and promise[1] of God, which thinks to be able to compensate for a Divine by a self-devised human institution. Jeroboam shows indeed a certain degree of earthly prudence in endeavouring[2] to adhere to old traditions that were sacred among the people in the form of worship to be introduced by him. He gives the people symbols of Jehovah, and such, indeed, as their fathers had once caused to be made by Aaron on Sinai, wherein he wisely gave special prominence to the advantage which the people would have from not being obliged any more to undertake a long journey to Jerusalem. רַב־לָכֶם וגו׳, "it is too much[3] for you to go to Jerusalem," that is, *nimis molestum est, ut e tam remotis locis ascendatis Hierosolymam.* Seb. Schm. By transferring the words, Ex. xxxii. 4, "Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of

[1] *Non enim confidebat promisso Dei per vatem facto, fore ut solium sibi posterisque stabiliretur modo pia animi inclinatione Deo adhaereret.* Wits. i. p. q. p. 309.

[2] *Prudentia ergo Jerobeamus populum ab eo quod avitum erat et imbibitum alienare noluit. Locum duntaxit mutavit, ritusque colendi, tum ministros etiam et tempus cultus, idque tam astute ut revocare potius ad omnium antiquissimos mores, quam novitiis initiari institutis Israelitae viderentur.* Wits. p. 310.

[3] De Wette, after Bochart (*Hieroz.* i. p. 355 f.), *sufficit vobis hactenus ascendisse*, falsely translates: "long enough have ye gone up to Jerusalem." Maurer also falsely explains: *satis est τοῦ ἀναβαίνειν.* For even if רַב with an infinitive following has this meaning, yet מִן cannot here be understood partitively, because the ἀναβαίνειν admits of no partition. The passages cited by Maurer, Ex. ix. 28, Ezek. xliv. 6, even if מִן is there to be taken partitively, prove nothing, because מִן in both stands before the *nom. plur.*

Egypt," to his calves he intended to intimate: *non est nova religio ; hoc cultu jam olim patres nostri in deserto usi sunt auctore ipso Aharone.* Seb. Schm. From this verbal reference to that fact it appears on the one hand, that the worship of the calves was no proper idolatry, from which also it is always distinguished in our books as in the prophets Hosea and Amos, but that under the symbol of the calves Jehovah was worshipped, on the other hand the Egyptian origin of this worship is thereby proved, for which Jeroboam was determined by his sojourn in Egypt.[1] Hence is explained also the setting up of two calves in imitation of the images of Apis and Mnevis; the connection with the golden calf worshipped at Sinai was partly suggested by the fact itself, inasmuch as this was only a copy of the Egyptian Apis, partly a stroke of policy in order to remove from this worship the objection of novelty, and attach to it greater sacredness. But did Jeroboam not know that even the worship of Jehovah by images was as strictly forbidden in the law as the worship of false gods? Was the fate of the golden calf cast by Aaron unknown to him? Did he not reflect, that at that time the people by the worship of it brought on themselves the wrath of God, and that only through the earnest intercession of Moses the punishment of extermination could be averted from the whole people? No doubt all this was known to him, but how little the natural heart

[1] How clearly the whole representation points to this connection has been already shown by Bochart, p. q. p. 354. Vatke, on the contrary, denies, indeed, the Egyptian origin of calf-worship (p. q. p. 398); but what he advances only affords evidence of the boundless audacity with which this criticism resolves to ignore all historical testimonies in order to defend its philosophical presuppositions of an original bull-worship of the Israelites, from which the worship of Jehovah developed itself only by degrees in a natural manner. Without even mentioning, much less refuting, the numerous testimonies of the ancients, collected by Bochart p. q. p. 345 ff. as to the worship of images of animals among the Egyptians, Vatke refers to a passage from Creuzer's Symbolik (i. 480 ff.), by no means confirming his view, in proof of this, that the Egyptians held only living animals sacred, but employed images of animals only as masks or in bas reliefs. But notwithstanding that Hengstenb. (Beitr. ii. p. 155 ff.) exposed the view of Vatke in all its nakedness, and again expressly cited the most conclusive passages of the ancients for the Egyptian origin of calf-worship, yet Br. Bauer (Relig. des A.T. ii. p. 180 f.) two years after ventured again to deny it, without even saying a word in refutation of Hengstenberg.

of man regards the word of God, if it forbid the object of his inclination, experience and history furnish a thousand examples, as in such cases the clearest and most explicit prohibition by good or bad reasons is put to silence or so explained and distorted that men think they may disregard it.[1] Thus Jeroboam also will have discovered explanations of this prohibition and of the historical facts testifying against the sin prohibited, by which he thought himself able to justify his proceedings, though they are not transmitted to us. The locality in which he placed the golden calves might appear to him a palliating circumstance. He did not select his own residence for this purpose, but Bethel and Dan. Bethel, on the boarders of Benjamin and Ephraim, see the particulars on 2 Ki. ii. 2, was a most holy place in the tradition of the people. There Jehovah appeared to the patriarch Jacob, from which the town got the name of "house of God" (Gen. xxxii.) Should not Jehovah, Jeroboam might imagine and endeavour to persuade others, manifest himself in this holy place to the posterity of Jacob as well as to their ancestor?—Dan, in the north of Palestine, at one of the sources of the Jordan, formerly called Laish, Judg. xviii. 26 ff., comp. Robins. iii. p. 617 f. and 626, was through the idols set up there by the Danites, to which even a grandson of Moses officiated as priest, likewise already consecrated as a seat of worship, to which might he added in the case of this place also a reference to the convenience of the people, that the Israelites dwelling in the north might not have a long way to go for the exercise of their worship.

Vv. 30, 31. The institution of this worship became a sin to Jeroboam, because it was contrary to the command of God, which not only forbade all worshipping of Jehovah by images and symbols, but also had not left the choice of the place of worship to the will of the people. The seats of worship, moreover, wanted the principal thing, by which alone they could have

[1] It testifies therefore of slight knowledge of men and small philological experience, when Paulus, Comm. z. N.T. iv. p. 230, de Wette Beitr. i. p. 204, and Gesen. *de Pentat. Samar*. p. 6, infer from the introduction of the calf-worship, that at that time the Mosaic law was not yet in existence. See the refutation of this futile argument in Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 174 ff.

become sanctuaries of Jehovah, namely, the ark with the real presence of God connected with it, which Jeroboam with all his ingenuity could represent by no corresponding symbol,[1] so that the sanctuary he erected for each of the golden calves, because it wanted the *praesentia numinis,* became בֵּית־בָּמוֹת "a house of high places."—The singular בֵּית בָּמוֹת, which LXX., *οἴκους ἐφ᾿ ὑψηλῶν,* and *Vulg., "fana in excelsis"* have arbitrarily changed into the plural, is explained by the tacit opposition to בֵּית יְהוָה. Instead of the house of God he made a house of high places. That this was done in both places, in which the golden calves were set up, is understood of itself, as they could not stand under the open heaven, but must have been set up in a house or temple, in which a sacrificial altar must have been erected. There is some obscurity in the words: וַיֵּלְכוּ הָעָם וגו׳ "and the people went before the one even to Dan," v. 30, which Seb. Schm. explains: *ea se contulit pars populi, quae in vicinia Danis erat.* Scarcely correct, for the עַד־דָּן does not accord with this. We are rather to understand by הָאֶחָד the golden calf set up at Bethel, and so must conceive the sense to be, that the people even to Dan, that is, the greater part of the people frequented the sanctuary at Bethel, as the majority gave this the preference, so that the other at Dan was worshipped only by a few. It is easy to perceive the reason of this. Bethel, on account of the manifestation of God to Jacob there, was regarded as a holy place, whereas Dan in past times could only point to an idol. "And

[1] When therefore Vatke i. p. q. p. 400 thus expresses himself: "Had the temple worship at that time actually had the character of a central and normal divine service, yet it was in the power of Jeroboam to found a similar one for the kingdom of Israel, especially as Jerusalem had not long been the centre of the kingdom, and prophetical decisions, if we regard them as historical and as the divine preparation and confirmation of the temple worship, might as well sanction the institution of an Israelitish central worship, as ratify the independent establishment of the kingdom (1 Ki. xi. 29 ff., xiv. 7 ff.)" he has entirely ignored the fact, that a temple only became a sanctuary to Israel on condition that Jehovah really manifested his presence in it in a symbolical way. But Jeroboam wanted not merely the ark, but also the divine commission for the foundation of another temple beside that of Jerusalem, and no prophet of the Lord could sanction it, after the Lord himself had chosen Jerusalem and the temple of Solomon for the sole place of the revelation of his name.

he made priests of all the people, who were not of the sons of Levi." This innovation appears very surprising, especially when we reflect, that even an Ephraimite (Judg. xvii. 10 ff.) rejoiced at this, that he had a Levite as priest for his idolatrous worship. If, therefore, Jeroboam makes those who are not Levites priests, this can only have been done, because the Levites wished to be priests לַיהוָה, not לָעֲגָלִים. This he could not concede to them, and therefore they were obliged to leave their district cities and their property in Israel, and emigrate into the kingdom of Judah (2 Chr. xi. 13 f.), and he was compelled to choose out of the whole people those to be priests for his בָּמוֹת and עֲגָלִים, who had the inclination to such a service (הֶחָפֵץ xiii. 33.) מִקְצוֹת הָעָם means not: *ex infima plebe* (Schulz), but *ex universo populo, quia extrema pertinent ad complementum rei*, as Bochart, *hieroz*. i. p. 356, *Lud. de Dieu ad Ezech*. xxxiii. 1, and Witsius p. q. p. 315, have rightly expounded.

V. 32 f. The feast of tabernacles also to be observed in the seventh month (Lev. xxiii. 34 ff.), Jeroboam transferred to the eighth month. A plausible occasion for this arbitrary deviation from the law, which repeatedly names (Lev. xxiii. 34, 39, 41) the seventh month as the time appointed of the Lord, might be found in the circumstance that in the northern districts of his kingdom the grain ripened at least a month later than in the southern Judah, as this festival was to be kept at the ingathering of the fruit of the land (the grain), Lev. xxiii. 39; the proper ground, however, lay in the design to make the separation also in a religious respect as complete as possible, although he adhered to the day of the month (the 15th) on account of the weak, who might take offence at the innovations. For that there were many besides the priests and Levites who were highly dissatisfied with these illegal proceedings, appears from the notice 2 Chr. xiii. 16, that Israelites out of all the tribes devoted in heart to the Lord went to Jerusalem to sacrifice there to the God of their fathers. Still not content with all this, with erecting sanctuaries and places of worship, instituting priests and changing feasts, Jeroboam himself offered sacrifice at the altar at Bethel in order to prove himself to be the spiritual head of his kingdom. V. 33 closes this section and introduces the fol-

lowing. Here the narrator again with emphasis puts forth the fact, that Jeroboam had of himself[1] devised the feast to be kept by the Israelites. The less ground there was for such a change, the more arbitrary and culpable it was. For his other religious innovations he might at least plead the necessity of giving to his kingdom a permanent unity and independence of the kingdom of Judah, but no such necessity existed for the change of the feast of tabernacles, as the already mentioned plausible occasion for it applied by no means to the whole kingdom, but at most to a small part of it, as the grain ripened about Bethel at the same time as in the environs of Jerusalem, since Bethel was only twelve Roman miles from Jerusalem.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

### PROPHECY AGAINST THE CALF-WORSHIP INTRODUCED BY JEROBOAM.

Vv. 1 and 2. While Jeroboam is still engaged in burning incense upon the altar comes a prophet[2] in the word of the Lord to Bethel, and proclaims by Divine revelation the coming destruction of the altar there. בִּדְבַר יְהוָֹה here means not, *jussu Jehovae* (Cler., Schulz), nor, "at the word of Jehovah" (de Wette); as this does not suit vv. 2, 9, and 17, but "in the word of the Lord," being as it were in it. The word of the Lord is conceived as a power, which comes over the prophet and impels him to utter the revelation made to him. Comp. 1 Sam. iii. 21, Jehovah revealed himself to Samuel בדבר יהוה. Besides

[1] מִלְּבַד means *seorsum*, so that there is no occasion for the reading of Keri מִלִּבּוֹ preferred by Hitzig, Begr. d. Krit. p. 128, comp. Maurer on this passage.

[2] The name of this prophet is unknown. An account of the statements, destitute of historical foundation, concerning him made by Josephus and some old ecclesiastical writers is given by Knobel, der Prophetism. d. Hebr. ii. p. 64, Not. 2.

this passage the phrase occurs in this sense only in our chapter repeatedly (vv. 2, 5, 9, 17, 18, 32) and xx. 35; elsewhere always in the derivative sense, on the word, according to the word of the Lord, comp. 2 Chr. xxx. 12; Num. xxxi. 16; 1 Chr. xxi. 19.—V. 2. "Behold a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name, who will offer upon thee (the altar) the priests of the high places, that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burned upon thee." In this prophecy, which was literally fulfilled according to 2 Ki. xxiii. 15 ff., the old theologians found an evident proof of the Divine inspiration of the prophecies. Even Grotius recognizes therein *ingens divinae gubernationis ac praescientiae indicium, quod et nomen ejus, qui rem praesignificatam effecturus erat, praedicitur. Simile Esai. 44, 28. Ad haec nihil sunt onmnuim gentium oracula.* The rationalists, on the contrary, who reject the Divine origin of prophecy and deny every definite prediction of future events, assert that this prediction was only defined after the event, while they find in the naming of Koresh, in the second part of Isaiah, the strongest ground for rejecting its genuineness. Even the modern believing theology cannot yet agree to recognize special predictions of things future in the prophets, much less the revelation of the name of an individual about to exist hereafter, and remove predictions of this kind into the department of soothsaying (Wahrsagung), from which prophecy (Weissagung) is distinguished by this, that the latter alone prognosticates in general the future, resulting from the connection of the Divine revelation with necessity. But this limitation of prophecy to general facts, resulting by inherent necessity from the historical present, is an arbitrary determination. The difference between soothsaying and prophecy consists in this, that soothsaying foretells details purely accidental, standing in no rational connection with the Divine plan of the world and of salvation; prophecy, on the contrary, attests its Divine origin by this, that, standing in the most intimate connection with the revelation of grace, it prognosticates the future of the kingdom of God and all that is connected with its development, not only in general, but also in particular. The predictions of the prophets, entering into the detail of concrete visions, are, therefore, not mere poetic delineations and individualisings of general ideas, but real pictures pre-

sented to the spirit of the prophet by the Spirit of God, which are certainly governed and penetrated by the general idea of salvation, but so that this idea presents itself in the most concrete determinations, often even of names and numbers, which are even taken from the department of the accidental, because they are concrete determinations of the general idea of salvation. Such concrete predictions of special facts of salvation are no doubt rarer than the general visions of the whole complex of the future development of the kingdom of God, so that of the prognostication of a name, besides Koresh in Isaiah, the genuineness of which, notwithstanding all assaults, maintains its ground, only the example in our verse is found. The prediction of this name would only stand in the category of divination, if it were merely accidental and stood in no essential connection with the determination of the person. It is so neither with the name Koresh[1] nor with our name Josiah.—יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ from אָשָׁה, أَسَى signifies: *quem Jehova fulcivit, quem Jeh. adjuvit* (comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 158), so that by the prediction the idea only is expressed, that to the house of David will be born a son, whom the Lord will support, establish, that he may execute judgment on the priests of the high places at Bethel.[2] At the ground of this judgment, as of the whole theocratic law, lies the *jus talionis*. On the same altar on which these priests offered are they themselves to be offered and their bones burned. The general expression, men's bones (עַצְמוֹת אָדָם) stands not for, their (the priests') bones, but is intentionally selected to denote men's corpses, as Josiah burned the bones, not merely of the priests slain by him, but at the same time of those long dead, which were taken out of their graves

[1] On the appellative meaning of the word Koresh, sun, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. i. 2, p. 192 f., Ges. *thes.* ii. p. 717, and Hävern. Einl. ii. 2, p. 165 f.

[2] The fulfilment of this and similar prophecies we are to regard so that the special events of the future, even to the names of individuals, were brought about and so realised at the proper time by the same Spirit of God, who had previously revealed them to the prophets, that the faithful could not mistake the hand of God. But they were not therefore fulfilled, because they were predicted, but they were predicted and previously revealed, because they were in future to enter into realization according to the counsel of the Lord.

(2 Ki. xxiii. 16), in order to desecrate the altar for ever by a double pollution, since to the abomination of human offering was added the pollution of human bones (Num. xix. 16.)

V. 3. For the confirmation of this prophecy the man of God gives also a miraculous sign[1]—the altar shall, by a miracle, be rent, and the ashes upon it shall be poured out—which took place immediately before the eyes of the king. V. 5. מוֹפֵת a miraculous appearance, τέρας, from the *rad.* أَفَتَ *avertit, amovit,* hence إِفْتٌ *camela excellens,* then, in general, *res mira, portentum,* comp. Kamus in Freitag, *lex. arab.* i. p. 43. Thus correctly, after A. Schultens *ad Job.* i. p. 423, J. D. Mich., and others, Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 45 ff., and Hävern. on Ezek. p. 160 ff. contrary to the incorrect explanation and derivation of Gesen. in *thes.* i. 143, and ii. 612 f. Only afterwards did מופת appropriate the idea of the אוֹת, σημεῖον, so that in this passage, as in Ezek. and Zech., it has the signification, miraculous sign.—דֶּשֶׁן not = אֵפֶר ashes in general, but ashes of animal offerings, as *Gussetius* has remarked. As the ashes of the offerings were to be removed from the altar, collected on the ash-heaps beside the altar, and then conveyed to a clean place without the camp (Lev. xvi. 3, 4); the pouring out of the ashes must be regarded as a sign of punishment, and not merely the natural consequence of the rending of the altar.

Vv. 4, 5. The importance of the authentication of the man of God by a miraculous sign appears from the conduct of Jeroboam towards him. Without waiting for the confirmation of his word by the announced miraculous sign, the king stretches his hand towards him with the words, Lay hold on him, but must now experience in the hand, with which he would set aside the prophet who was disagreeable to him, the omnipotence of the Lord, who has power to protect his servants. The outstretched hand is withered by a miracle, that is, stiffened, deprived of vital juice, so that he cannot draw it in again. On this follows the miraculous sign announced, and Jeroboam's wicked arrogance is broken down by the double miracle; he is constrained to entreat

[1] *Tunc adjicit signum, quo probaret, sua verba non esse ficta, sed se a Deo esse missum, et quod quæ dixerat eventura essent.* Vatablus.

the prophet to intercede for him with the Lord his God that his hand may be restored. חִלָּה אֶת־פְּנֵי פל׳, to make weak, soften the face of any one, that is, to entreat so imploringly, that the other cannot refuse that which is sought or behave with rigour, comp. Hengstenb. Comm. ü. d. Ps. ii. p. 425.

Vv. 7—10. After his hand was restored by the prophet's intercession, Jeroboam wishes to gain by civility the man of God, whom he could not crush by his power, in order to render harmless his vexatious message, at least in the eyes of the people. For this purpose, and not to honour him, and prove himself thankful for the restoration of his hand, he invites him to his house to refresh himself with food (comp. on סעד Gen. xviii. 5; Judg. xix. 5) and give him a present. But this design also is defeated, and the rejection of his worship on the part of God only manifested the more. "If thou wilt give me half thine house, I will not go in with thee, nor eat or drink in this place—for the Lord has forbidden me." The subject of צִוָּה is יהוה to be supplied from the connexion of thought, comp. Ew. heb. Gr. § 551. God forbade him to do this *ad detestationem idololatriae, ut ipso facto ostenderet Bethelitas idololatras adeo esse detestabiles et a Deo quasi excommunicatos, ut nullum fidelium cum iis cibi vel potus communionem habere velit.* Thus correctly *C. a Lapide;* but when he endeavours to explain in the same way the command not to return the same way he came, the unsatisfactoriness of the remark, *quasi via in Bethel ob ejus idola esset polluta et execranda nec ullo modo revisenda,* is immediately apparent. The remark also of Seb. Schm., *ne occurreret ulli, qui eum prius vidisset adeoque de novo cum eo in colloqium veniret et moras necteret; noverat enim Deus prophetae hujus animum, quod libenter mansurus esset,* is not satisfactory. For irrespective of the circumstance, that in this case the prohibition was insufficient, as if he wished to delay, he could enter into conversation also with any one he met on the other way, the object of this prohibition must be essentially the same with that regarding eating and drinking. The correct answer is that of Buddeus, *hist. eccl. V. T.* ii. p. 282: *ne forte a Jerobeamo retractus in ejus gratiam aliquid faceret, quod propheta indignum esset, aut ex quo colligi posset, gratiam quandam numinis idololatras sperare posse.*

Vv. 11—19. The man of God had resisted the offers of Jero-

boam; but when an old prophet of Bethel, who hastened after him when he learned his story, invited him to return to his house and refresh himself with food and drink, and appealed for his invitation to a Divine revelation, he became unfaithful to the Divine command, and allowed himself to be induced, by the lying pretence of the old prophet, that an angel, by the word of the Lord, had charged him with the invitation, to turn back, and stop with the old prophet. It is not easy to comprehend the conduct of this old prophet at Bethel. Was he a true prophet, as, after Ephraim. Syr., and Theodoret, Herm. Witsius (*miscell. ss.* i. p. 116. *ed. nov.* 1736), Knobel i. p. q. p. 66 f., and Köster i. p. q. p. 68 suppose, or a false prophet, for which, with the Chald., Josephus, Procop. of Gaza, most of the Rabbins, and older Catholic as well as Protestant expositors declare themselves? Our judgment of this depends on the answer to the farther question, did he seduce the Jewish prophet to transgress the Divine command? As the man of God from Judah had abundantly proved himself by a double miracle to be a true prophet of the Lord, the invitation of the prophet of Bethel could only spring either from the intention to tempt him, that is, to bring him to ruin, and to take from his prediction its effect on the king and people, or the desire to refresh himself by intercourse with him, and derive profit from his prophetical gift for his own spiritual life. No third case is conceivable. But if we consider the first view correct, we may either suppose with *Alph. Tostatus* in Seb. Schm., *hunc prophetam esse factum sacerdotem a Jerobeamo timuisseque pro commodo, si Jerobeam abrogaret cultum idololatricum: ideoque cogitasse de rege in impietate confirmando, detracta per seductionem prophetae divino vaticinio fide*, or with Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 9) say, *δείσας μὴ παρευδοκιμήσειεν αὐτὸν ὁ ξένος παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ, καὶ πλείονος ἀπολάβοι τιμῆς.* But the farther course of the affair agrees neither with the one nor with the other of these assumptions; neither the Divine revelation communicated to the old prophet at table concerning the punishment awaiting the man of God for his disobedience to the express command of God; nor the honour of burial conferred on the dead by the old prophet after the infliction of this punishment, and his being accredited by the confirmation of his prediction uttered against the altar at Bethel. Had the old prophet

intended to exalt himself to the prejudice of the other in the eyes of Jeroboam and the people, or to involve in ruin the man of God from Judah, he would not have again elevated and justified him by the confirmation of his prophecy. God the Lord would also have imparted no revelation to such a character.[1]

[1] Theodoret and Witsius, though far from excusing the lie, as Knobel i. p. q. does, adduce in proof that the old prophet was a true prophet, 1. *quia Deus prædixit per eum viro Dei id quod ei eventurum erat; 2. quia propheta neque aliter in scriptura vocatur; 3. quia credidit prædictis de Josia. Sed nec pietati omni destitutus fuisse videtur, quum agnoverit in viro isthoc aequitatem divini judicii ipseque justa ei fecerit eodemque voluerit condi loculo* (Wits. l. c.). But if Buddeus (*hist. eccl.* ii., p. 283) objects to 1.: *et alias impiis hominibus Deum quaedam revelasse*, all historical proof of this fails, unless we wish arbitrarily to weaken the term *impiis*. Buddeus had probably Balaam in view, as J. J. Hess. Gesch. d. Könige v. Jud. i., p. 36, calls the prophet of Bethel in character and history a counterpart of Balaam; but Balaam's character is altogether different. Balaam shows himself selfish indeed, but he did not permit himself to forge a Divine revelation in order to deceive; he wished no doubt to prophesy to please Balak, but he unconditionally adhered to the Divine communication, although he afterwards fell back again into his old carnal mind. Thus if Balaam was no pious man or true prophet, yet we cannot deny to him all fear of God or number him among ordinary false prophets, comp. Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bib. p. 6, ff. On the other hand had the old prophet of Bethel actually had the bad intention attributed to him, to ruin the prophetical character of the man of God from Judah, God would not have employed him as his organ. This feeling has forced itself even on the advocates of this opinion, so that Josephus changes the history and makes not the old prophet pronounce concerning the man of God from Judah, but the latter to utter the revelation himself, and even Hess, p. 34, would willingly declare the prophecy "a cunning artifice of the old prophet, still more to disconcert him from Judah, if the threatening had not been fulfilled immediately after in so remarkable a manner." We must therefore explain the subsequent conduct of the old prophet towards the man of God from Judah either with Hess as a new act of hypocrisy, or with Buddeus derive it from a previous conversion, which the text in no way warrants. Buddeus and the old expositors have been misled partly by 2 Ki. xxiii., 18, to an unfair judgment as to the prophet of Bethel, since they conclude from the remark there אֲשֶׁר־ בָּא מִשֹּׁמְרוֹן: *eum antea habitasse in Samaria et inde rerum suarum sedem Bethelem transtulisse, non aliam ob causam, quam ut Jerobeami captaret benevolentiam.* But he could not have come from the city of Samaria, as it was not then in existence, (comp. chap. xvi. 24). שֹׁמְרוֹן denotes the land of Israel in opposition to Judah (v. 17), and the whole statement conveys nothing but the Israelitish origin of the prophet.

There remains then only the other supposition, that the design of the old prophet in compelling his associate in office from Judah to stop at his house was good and well meant, that it sprang from the desire to enter into closer acquaintance with him, thus as Theodoret expresses himself *οὐχ ἵνα τοῦτον βλάψῃ, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτὸς μεταλάβῃ τῆς εὐλογίας*. But that in order to make sure of his wish he availed himself of a sinful expedient, a lie, Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 149 has thus correctly explained: "In the innovations of Jeroboam he had committed sin by silence. What the Jewish prophet did brought him to the consciousness of what he himself should have done. Seized with shame for his fall, he wishes to raise himself again to respect from himself and from others by intercourse with the witness of the Lord." By this it is determined at the sametime, that he was no false, but a true prophet of the Lord, who was weak indeed for a time, and in consequence of this weakness fell into the sin of lying; but by the consequences, which his sin brought on the Jewish prophet, was brought again to the full consciousness of his prophetic call, and then proved this consciousness by the honour conferred on his brother in office when punished with death as well as by the corroborative assent to his prophetic sentence.—The *plur.* וַיְסַפְּרוּם v. 11 after the foregoing *sing.* וַיְסַפֶּר may be explained either with Münster, Clarius, and others by this, that the remaining sons agreed with the narrative of the first, or with Vatabl. so that one related the matter in the name of all, and thus the relation might be attributed to all.—"And he found him sitting under the terebinth" (v. 14), probably to rest himself. By the definite article the terebinth is rendered prominent as having been distinguished from others, and generally known by some event (comp. Ew. Gr. § 533.) The older expositors find here *peccati initium, moras utique nectere non debuit.* But as God did not expressly recommend him to make haste on his return, there was no transgression of the Divine command in sitting down, although the delay thence arising became an occasion of sin to him, inasmuch as the prophet of Bethel might now overtake him. Moreover the man of God from Judah might easily have detected the lie of the prophet of Bethel, for 1. *cum ipso locutus est ipse Deus: at senex mentitur angeli sermonem. Atqui si Deus loquitur, non est credendum contrarium, si vel angelus e cœlo*

*venerit (Gal.* i.) 2. *Verbum Dei sibi ipsi non contrariatur. Seb. Schm.*

Vv. 20—25. Most expositors consider the guilt of the old prophet who tempted to be greater than that of the man of God from Judah, who was misled by his lie to the transgression of the express command of God; but if we consider the circumstances carefully, the guilt appears at least equally great on both sides. The old prophet of Bethel chose a sinful objectionable means to a good end; he wished to rise again by fellowship with a true prophet, and by no means to injure the other, the Jewish prophet had no ground for transgressing the Divine command, but the sensual desire of bodily refreshment by food and drink. From the mouth therefore of him whose pretended communication from an angel he thoughtlessly believed he must soon receive a true revelation of God, the prediction of punishment for his disobedience to the command of God: "Forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of the Lord and hast not kept his commandment, thy carcase shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy fathers," that is, *morte violenta, antequam in patriam redeas, peribis* (J. H. Mich). And only too soon was the prediction verified. On his way back a lion met him and slew him. In order however that no one might see in this only a misfortune happening to him by accident, but might plainly recognize the punitive hand of the Lord, the lion, contrary to his nature, neither rends the body nor slays the ass, on which the prophet rode, but stands by the body cast on the ground and the ass standing beside it, so that those passing by saw the miracle and reported it in Bethel.

Vv. 26—32. As soon as the old prophet heard what had occurred, he explained to the people the miracle, and thereby confirmed the Divine mission of the Jewish prophet, who was thus punished for his disobedience to the command of God; he then went for his body, which he found still unmutilated with the lion and the ass standing quietly by it, as the passers by reported, who brought the news to Bethel, interred him with all honour in his own grave, and finally charges his sons after his death, to bury him in the same grave beside his bones, because the word of the Lord which he cried against the altar in Bethel and against all the houses of the high places of Samaria, will surely be ful-

filled.—שָׁבַר (vv. 26, 28) *frangere*, of the lion, who crushes his prey. In the same sense the Latins use *frangere* and *confringere*, and the Arabs هَشَمَ, comp. Bochart. *hieroz.* i., p. 740.—הוֹי אָחִי alas my brother! is an expression of the usual lamentation over a departed friend, Jer. xxii. 18.—The words: "And against all the houses of the high places in the cities of Samaria" are partly prophetical; for at that time, beside that of Bethel, there was only a high place erected at Dan, but after such a beginning their speedy multiplication might be anticipated with certainty. שֹׁמְרוֹן stands *per prolepsin* for the designation of the kingdom of the ten tribes, for this name could only come into use after the building of the city Samaria (xvi. 24.) The Divine intention in this miraculous history Theodoret has rightly discerned: *ἐκ δὲ τούτου διηγήματος διδασκόμεθα, ὡς δυνατοὶ δυνατῶς ἐτασθήσονται. οὐ γὰρ ἔδει τὸν τῆς θείας ἀκηκοότα φωνῆς ἀνθρωπίνῃ πιστεῦσαι τἀναντία λεγούσῃ, ἀλλ' ἀναμεῖναι τὸν προστεταχότα λῦσαι ὅπερ γενέσθαι προσέταξεν. ἐγὼ δὲ οἶμαι καὶ εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς περὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου προῤῥήσεως τήνδε λενέσθαι τὴν τιμωρίαν. οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν λαθεῖν ἀνδρὸς τοσούτου διήγημα· τοῖς δὲ ἀκούουσι ἱκανὸν ἦν τοῦτο δέος ἐνθεῖναι. εἰ γὰρ τροφῆς μετάληψις παρὰ τὴν θείαν ἐντολὴν γενομένη, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἡδονῆς ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀπάτης, γεγενημένη, τοσαύτην ἀνδρὶ δικαίῳ τιμωρίαν ἐπήνεγκεν, ὁποίαις περιπεσοῦνται κολάσεσιν οἱ τὸν μὲν πεποιηκότα καταλελοιπότες Θεὸν, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων προσκυνοῦντες ἰνδάλματα.*[1]

[1] Add to this the appropriate remark of Witsius p. q. i. p. 118: *Denique tot admiranda in unum concurrentia effecerunt, ut vaticinium adversus aram Betheliticam in omnium ore atque memoria versaretur, et legatio hujus prophetae multo redderetur conspectior et illustrior. Ita senis Bethelitici mendacium ipsi quidem infamiam inussit, soli viro Dei nimis credulo nocuit; at veritati confirmandae et publicandae, Divina faciente providentia, insigniter inservivit.* The accumulation, so offensive to the rationalists, of the miraculous in our chapter corresponds with the great object of the mission of the man of God, by which the Lord intended at the very introduction of the idolatrous practices of Jeroboam to enter a strong protest against them, in order to guard the god-fearing in Israel, of whom there were still not a few (2 Chr. xi. 16; 1 Ki. xviii. 3, xix. 12), against apostasy by taking part in the worship of the calves, but to render the godless, who joined in it, *ἀναπολογήτους* at the day of judgment. Even if Jeroboam, therefore, the author of this idolatry with those like-minded with him, notwithstanding this emphatic warning, did not turn from his evil ways, yet

Vv. 33, 34. This event however made no particular impression on Jeroboam. He continued his sinful course, and made of the whole people priests of the high places, whoever would, comp. xii. 31. הֶחָפֵץ יְמַלֵּא וגו cannot be rendered with the Chald.: *qui volebant, offerebant munus et erant sacerdotes;* for מִלֵּא אֶת־יָדוֹ denotes in the language of the law, Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9—35, consecration to the priesthood, according to the *ritus* usual in this consecration; to lay the parts of the sacrifice, which were to come upon the altar, and thus properly belonged to Jehovah, in the hands of the party to be consecrated, thereby to fill the hands, by which, according to Bähr's correct explanation (Symbol. ii. p. 426), a presenting therewith on the part of Jehovah might be indicated; as the phrase מִלֵּא יָד לַיהוָה, Ex. xxxii. 29; 1 Chr. xxix. 5; 2 Chr. xxix. 31, signifies to "present gifts to the Lord." V. 34. And there was in this thing (through it) cause of sinning to the house of Jeroboam, and of its extirpation and destruction from the face of the earth; that is, this obstinate perseverance in his illegal ungodly course, notwithstanding the warning expressly given to him, brought his house into sin, and became the cause of its extirpation, which also was soon after announced to him.

it was no more purposeless and unprofitable on this account than the narrative of this miracle is unhistorical, because Vatke i. p. q. p. 400 is pleased to call it "marvellous." As long as the rationalism and pantheism of our day can do nothing more with these and similar miracles than either with Eichhorn (Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Litt. iv. 210 ff.), explain them as natural and distort them, or with G. L. Bauer (hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 130), pronounce them to be myths and assert their impossibility without any rational ground, merely from certain fixed presuppositions of the finite understanding, no particular refutation of their views is needed. As fixed ideas and pure fancies of unbelief they will not escape their destiny after a short period to fall into total oblivion.

## CHAPTER XIV. 1—20.

### PROPHECY AGAINST THE HOUSE OF JEROBOAM AND THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL, VV. 1—18. JEROBOAM'S DEATH, VV. 19, 20.

Vv. 1—3. The first visitation which befel Jeroboam, was the sickness of his son Abijah. To ask advice concerning him he sends his wife to Ahijah in Shiloh, to the prophet who had predicted to him the kingdom over the ten tribes, but disguised, that she might not be recognised by the prophet as the king's wife. He did not wish by this disguise to conceal from the people, that he acknowledged Jehovah still as the true God, and was compelled to consult him concerning the future (Seb. Schm.), for he had the less need to be afraid of the people on this account, because the worship introduced by him, although illegal, was yet dedicated to Jehovah, but he wished to deceive in this way the old prophet Ahijah, of whom he expected otherwise no favourable answer, because he was acting directly contrary to his advice (xi. 38.) הִשְׁתַּנָּה, to change herself, change her appearance, that is, disguise herself.—"Who spake of me for king (לְמֶלֶךְ), that is, to be king over this people." The connexion of לְמֶלֶךְ with דִּבֶּר עָלַי arises from this, that the word uttered by the prophet as a word of God includes its own realization in itself, the prediction that he would be king involves the appointment to be king, comp. 1 Sam. xxv. 30, xiii. 14.—V. 3. "And take in thine hand ten loaves and cakes and a cruse of honey." These gifts were to be an honorary present for the prophet (comp. 1 Sam. ix. 8, and Winer, bibl. R. W. i. p. 482), but were designedly small, because the queen wished to pass for a common citizen's wife. נִקֻּדִים denotes here unquestionably some kind of cake; with this agree the old versions, LXX., *κολλυρίδες*, *Vulg. crustula*, Pesh. ܟܥܟܐ, *Targ.* כִּסְנִין, comp. Buxtorf, *lex. chald. rabb. talm. p.* 1064. But the particular kind cannot be ascertained. In Josh. ix. 5—12, where also the word occurs, it probably denotes crumbs of bread, not musty bread, comp. Gesen. *thes.* ii. 909.

Vv. 4, 5. Jeroboam supposed he could deceive the old prophet in this way, because his eyes were blind from age, but the Lord revealed to the old man the whole matter before the queen arrived, and charged him what he was to announce to her.—קָמוּ עֵינָיו, "his eyes stood," that is, were stiff, so that he could not see, comp. 1 Sam. iv. 15, a description of the so-called drop serene, *amaurosis*, which in extreme age is wont to arise from decay of the optic nerve.—כָּזֹה וְכָזֶה, so and so. Concerning the form זֹה only occurring in connexion with זֶה, Judg. xviii. 4; 2 Sam. xi. 26, comp. Hupfeld in the Ztschr. f. d. Kunde des Morgenl. ii. 3, p. 431.—וִיהִי כְבֹאָהּ וגו׳ "and it shall be, when she comes and makes herself strange," that is, when on her coming she makes herself strange, thou shalt speak to her so and so. On the ו of consecution before the *fut. apoc.*, comp. Ew. Gramm. § 618.

Vv. 6—11. As soon, therefore, as she entered the door of his house, the blind Ahijah addresses her by name, charges her with dissimulation, and announces to her that he is sent (charged) to her with a hard word (message.) קָשָׁה (comp. xii. 13) here in substance the same as חָזוּת קָשָׁה, Is. xxi. 2. Hereupon he opens to her the hard message, with the direction annexed to deliver it to Jeroboam: "because Jeroboam had not answered the Divine purpose in elevating him to be prince of his people Israel, had not, as David, followed the commandments of God with all his heart to do only that which is right in the eyes of God, but had done worse than all who were before him *(judices nimirum et duces Jisraelis. Cler.)*, made himself strange gods and molten images (that is, the golden calves) contrary to the express command of God, Ex. xx. 2, 3 (whence their designation as אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים is taken) and rejected the Lord; therefore his whole house is to be exterminated." The expression, occurring again only in Ezek. xxiii. 35, to cast God behind his back, denotes in the strongest manner wilful disregard of God, the direct opposite of the phrase, to have God before the eyes and in the heart, and is stronger than the expression, to cast the law behind the back, Neh. ix. 26. In Is. xxxviii. 17 the phrase, to cast behind the back, is used of God not regarding, that is, forgiving sins.—

V. 10. מַשְׁתִּין בְּקִיר *mingens in parietem*, denotes neither the dog (Ephr. Syr. *Oper.* i. p. 542, Kimchi, Jarchi, Judah ben Karish, Abul., Michael., Dathe, etc.) nor *abjectissimum et vilissimum quemque hominem* (Winer, Maur., Thenius on 1 Sam. xxv. 22, and Jahn, bibl. Archæol. i. 2, p. 77), but according to R. Levi, Elias, Bochart *hieroz.* i. p. 675 f. etc., *marem* or *virum* as appears from the explanatory apposition עָצוּר וְעָזוּב here and xxi. 21, 2 Ki. ix. 8, or וְגֹאֲלָיו וְרֵעֵהוּ xvi. 11.[1] The words עצור ועזוב which our author in the passage quoted, and 2 Ki. xiv. 26, has taken from Deut. xxxii. 36 are also variously explained. As the old interpretations in Rosenm. (*Schol. in Deut.* p. q.) are mostly arbitrary, the only question can be, whether they signify with Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 1008) and Winer (*lex. man.* p. 706) *mancipium et manumissum s. liberum*, or with *Lud. de Dieu* in Deut. xxxii. 36, *connubio junctum s. patrem familias et caelibem.* Of these two interpretations the first is unfounded, the other is confirmed by the Arabic usage as well as the context. For עָצַר to hold back, confine, does not suit for designating the slave, as the slaves of Israel were not treated as slaves, and עָזַב to leave, let go, is never used of the manumission of slaves. But even if the two words actually had the assigned

[1] Beside the present passage this phrase occurs only in 1 Sam. xxv. 22 and 34, and indeed in the same phrase, of the extirpation of a family to the last man. Thenius on the passage infers from the (v. 22) added מִכָּל־אֲשֶׁר לוֹ, that the expression may have been originally understood of the dog and only afterwards of the lowest class of men. But this is not conclusive; כל אשר לו may very well denote all the males belonging to the house of Nabal. The objection raised against the most obvious explanation of the male gender, *quod homines bene morati in oriente nonnisi sedentes, neque facile in aliorum conspectu mingere solent* is shown by Herodot. ii. 35, Xenoph., Cyrop. i. 2, § 16, Ammian. Marcell. 23, 6, only to be an Egyptian and Persian custom, and even by the testimonies of travellers adduced by Jahn i. p. q. not a general custom of all Orientals, and therefore not of the Hebrews, while Bochart *l. c.* has quoted testimonies for the contrary. Therewith fall to the ground (*a*), the assumption, that the words denote the lowest class of men, which suits none of the biblical passages and is by no means proved by the Syrian usage (comp. *Assemani biblioth. orient.* ii. p. 260), and (*b*) the opinion adopted by Gesenius in the *lex. man.* from *L. de Dieu, animadv. in* 1 Sam. xxv. 22, that the phrase signifies *parvulum s. puerum contemtim fere.*

meanings, the *clausi et manumissi* could not include *omnes omnino homines*, because the Israelites were not a nation of slaves. On the contrary, עָזוּב from עָזַב may very well signify him who is left to himself or single, for in Arab. عَزِيبٌ عَزَبٌ means *is qui familia caret, caelebs*, comp. Freytag's *lex.* iii. p. 150. The opposite of this is עָצוּר bound to the house, the family, for which the passage cited by *L. de Dieu* from the *Kamus* أَعْمَرُ *idem quod* أَبُو قَبِيلَةٍ *pater familias*, is decisive. Both words connected denote all the individual males found in a house. That this signification suits all the passages needs no farther proof.—These words, moreover, are not, as *L. de Dieu* thinks, to be added as another class to the מַשְׁתִּין בְּקִיר, but are an explanatory description of this phrase, as we see from the absence of the *cop.* ו. This ו stands indeed in xxi. 21, and 2 Ki. ix. 8, but there ו—ו is to be understood in the sense of *et—et.*—The words: "I will sweep out after the house of Jeroboam, as one sweepeth out dirt till it is gone," express its ignominious and utter extermination.—This thought is again carried out v. 11: none of the exterminated are to come to the grave, but their bodies are to be consumed by the dogs and the fowls of the air, comp. xvi. 4, xxi. 24. A very painful punishment already in the law, Deut. xxviii. 6, threatened to transgressors, there to lie unburied, was to the Israelites and other ancient nations a horrible thought, and the greatest insult that could be done to a slaughtered foe, comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 44, 46, and Winer bibl. R.W. i. p. 170, Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 620. From the law this threat is often repeated by Jeremiah in particular (vii. 33, viii. 2, ix. 22, xii. 9, xiv. 16, xvi. 4, xix. 7, xxv. 33, etc.), but also by the other prophets (Ezek. xxix. 5, xxxix. 17, etc.), against the ungodly.—The dogs in the East run about the towns without owners, and are so wild and greedy of flesh that they even consume a carcase, xxi. 19, comp. Harmar Beob. i. p. 198, Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 207, and iv. p. 36 ff., and the documents quoted in Winer's bibl. R.W. i. 611.

Vv. 12—14. Hereupon Ahijah gives Jeroboam's wife an answer concerning her sick son. He will die when she enters

the city, and alone of all the male members of Jeroboam's house will receive the honour of a solemn burial, because there is found in him some good thing towards Jehovah. See the fulfilment, vv. 17, 18. But the Lord will raise up a king over Israel, who will cut off the house of Jeroboam, namely Baasha, xv. 27 f. From this turn in the prophet's discourse connecting the death of the child with the raising up of another king over Israel, as well as from the general lamentation of the people at his death, we may infer with great probability, that the sick son of Jeroboam was heir presumptive to the throne, on whom the people and the king placed great hopes. There is a difficulty in the last words of v. 14 זֶה הַיּוֹם וּמֶה גַּם־עַתָּה. The explanations of the ancients are mostly so arbitrary that we may omit them. They generally take זה היום for הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, against which *L. de Dieu*, and recently again Maurer have justly declared. Maur. explains from Judg. iv. 14 זה היום *hic est dies, scil. quo prædicatio mea eventum habebit*, but this supplement is not warranted by the passage quoted. זה היום can only mean, this to-day, that is, this will happen to-day, namely Jeroboam's son will die and be generally lamented.[1] This is followed by ומה גם עתה as the reflection of the prophet, the meaning of which Maur. seems to have rightly apprehended: *et quid jam nunc sc. fit, i.e. imo jam hoc ipso temporis momento Jerobeami spes optima generis in eo est ut extinguatur*. This view is at least more satisfactory than that proposed by Ges. *thes.* i. 294.

Vv. 15, 16. But in order that Jeroboam may understand the whole severity of the Divine judgment for his sins, the same prophet, who predicted to him the sovereignty of the ten tribes, must even now announce to him the banishment of Israel from the land given to their fathers beyond the Euphrates. "The Lord will smite Israel as the reed is shaken in the water," that is, will hang such penal judgments over Israel, that it will shake as a reed agitated by a strong wind in the water, that has no firm hold in order to resist the force of the wind and the waves,— "and shall root them out of this good land, which he gave to

[1] To this view the grammatical objection cannot be made, that זֹאת ought to be found, as not seldom, where a thing is spoken of indefinitely, the more easy *masc.* זֶה is placed, com. Ew. Gramm. § 364.

their fathers," as Moses Deut xxix. 27 had threatened to the transgressors, "and shall scatter them beyond the river (Euphrates)" among the heathen, out of whom God had chosen and called their ancestor, Jos. xxiv. 3. See the fulfilment of this threat 2 Ki. xv. 29, xvii. 23, and xviii. 11.—אֲשֵׁרִים denotes here idols in general; from v. 16 the golden calves set up by Jeroboam are specially meant. Comp. on v. 23.—וְיִתֵּן that he may give up; the ו *relat.* stands before the *fut. apoc.* in the sense of the Latin *ut* with the conjunctive, Ew. Gramm. § 618.

Vv. 19, 20. Close of the reign of Jeroboam. Of his wars, which were recorded in the annals of the kings of Israel, we know nothing; but comp. v. 30.—On the סֵפֶר דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים וגו׳ comp. the Introduction.

---

## CHAPTER XIV. 21—31.

### REIGN OF REHOBOAM OF JUDAH. COMP. 2 CHR. XI. 5—XII. 16.

V. 21. Rehoboam was forty-one years old, when he came to the sovereignty, and therefore was born a year before Solomon ascended the throne, comp. ii. 24 and iii. 1. This statement, which is confirmed by 2 Chr. xii. 13, has been on insufficient grounds declared false by Ludw. Capell., Grotius, Cleric., J. D. Mich., and others: for it is not proved either by the passages iii. 7, 1 Chr. xxxii. 5, 2 Chr. x. 8, 11, or even by the LXX. in the addition to xii. 24, that Rehoboam was sixteen years old when he became king, and reigned twelve years, as the arbitrary character of this version is known.—By the description of Jerusalem, as the city which the Lord chose out of all the tribes to put his name there (xi. 36) is expressed a disapproval of the apostasy of the ten tribes.—The name of his mother, Naamah the Ammonitess, is mentioned here and v. 31, not *quia ea filio idololatriæ ansam dedisse videtur* (Schulz), although this was the case with the mother of Asa (xv. 13), but because she appears to have had as queen mother considerable influence in the go-

vernment, as the sultana Walide in the Turkish empire, comp. Jos. v. Hammer, des osmanischen Reichs Staatsverf. ii. p. 68 and 71 ff. Hence in the successive accounts of every Jewish king the name of his mother is mentioned, xv. 2, 13, xxii. 42, etc.

Vv. 22, 23. While in Chronicles are given several details of the reign of Rehoboam, as the fortification of several cities, the account of his wives, his sons and their distribution in the kingdom (2 Chr. xi. 5—22), our author contents himself with a very brief summary description of the spirit of his reign. By the apostasy of the ten tribes and the announcement of the prophet, that the thing proceeded from the Lord as a punishment of the idolatry of Solomon (xii. 23 ff. and 2 Chr. xi. 2 ff.) Rehoboam seems to have been brought to reflection, so that in the first years of his reign he endeavoured earnestly to follow the law of God. But this reformation, in which king and people were moreover confirmed by the Israelites who (2 Chr. xi. 16 f.) immigrated from Israel to Judah and Jerusalem, was not lasting; only three years did he walk in the ways of David and Solomon (2 Chr. xi. 17.) After he thought his kingdom sufficiently fortified, and himself strong enough to be secure, he forsook the law of the Lord and all Israel with him (2 Chr. xii. 1.) The external worship of Jehovah remained indeed undisturbed: the king himself in royal state went to the house of the Lord (v. 28), but in heart had they (king and people) became unfaithful to the Lord, so that high places, monumental stones and idols were erected in the whole land, and the apostasy was more grievous than ever before. "Judah did evil in the sight of the Lord, and they provoked him to jealousy above all that their fathers had done with their sins."—The expression קִנֵּא to provoke to jealousy (Num. v. 14) is explained by the view of the relation of God to his people running through the whole of scripture under the figure of a marriage, in which God is the husband of his people, who is provoked to jealousy by the unfaithfulness of this his wife. From this view the Lord is called, Ex. xx. 5; Deut. iv. 24, אֵל קַנָּא, who suffers the worship of no other god, Ex. xxxiv. 14 f.—V. 23. "And they also (as the Israelites) built them בָּמוֹת high places (comp. on iii. 3), מַצֵּבוֹת monumental pillars

and אֲשֵׁרִים wooden idols.—מַצֵּבוֹת are not idols,[1] but מַצֵּבָה is a stone set up for a monument, either as a monument of a manifestation of God, Gen. xxviii. 18—22, xxxv. 14, or of a covenant made, Gen. xxxi. 13; Ex. xxiv. 4 (the twelve stones that Moses set up at the making of the covenant around the altar erected on Mount Sinai according to the number of the twelve tribes of Israel) or of any other important event, as the מצבה at Rachel's grave, Gen. xxxv. 20. Such stones, as Jacob erected at Bethel, the Canaanites raised in honour of their gods. Moses therefore commands, "thou shalt not worship their (the Canaanites') gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works, but shalt overthrow them, and break down their מַצֵּבוֹת," Ex. xxiii. 24, and "ye shall not make you idols (אֱלִילִם nothings) nor פֶּסֶל (graven image), nor rear you up מַצֵּבָה nor set up an image of stone (אֶבֶן מַשְׂכִּית) in your land to worship it: for I am the Lord your god," Lev. xxvi. 1. Then the מצבות are very often mentioned in connection partly with אשרים alone, partly also with altars and idols, thus Ex. xxxiv. 13, "their (the Canaanites') altars ye shall destroy, break their מצבות and cut down their אשרים:" thus also Deut. vii. 5, with the addition, "and burn their פְּסִילִים with fire," and Deut. xii. 3, only with the difference, "and burn their אשרים with fire, and hew down the graven images of their gods;" finally, Deut. xvi. 21 f., "Thou shalt not plant thee אֲשֵׁרָה of any wood near unto the altar of thy God, which thou shalt make thee. Neither shalt thou set thee up מצבה, which the Lord thy God hateth." Accordingly in the Books of Kings and Chronicles now the erection of מצבות and אשרים, now their destruction is mentioned, so here and 2 Chr. xiv. 2; 2 Ki. xvii. 10, xviii. 4; and 2 Chr. xxxi. 1; 2 Ki. xxiii. 14. From all these passages it appears, that the מצבות

[1] Altogether unfounded is the assertion of Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 510, that "the idols מצבות were partly molten מַסֵּכָה, נֶסֶךְ, partly carved פֶּסֶל, פְּסִיל," for פסל and פסילים are distinct from מצבה and מַצֵּבוֹת, comp. Lev. xxvi. 1; Deut. vii. 5, xii. 3; Mic. v. 12.—But with נסך and מסכה מצבה comes into connection in no conceivable way, because a stone monument and a molten image are quite heterogeneous.

were no proper idols, but stone monuments, to which idolatry attached itself as to the במות; but from the frequent connection of the מצבות with the אשרים it may be farther concluded that where reverence for these images degenerated into idolatry, the worship of Baal was attached to the מצבות, that of Asherah or Astarte to the אשׁרים. The opinion, therefore, frequently brought forward by Movers, that the מצבות were always monumental columns of Baal, is in this universality false.[1] The מצבות belong to the same category as the במות. Both were originally dedicated by the Israelites to Jehovah, the במות as places of sacrifice, the מצבות as monuments of some manifestation of Divine grace, but were, after the giving of the law by Moses, generally classed with idolatry as unlawful places and indications of worship, not only because in all self-devised Divine worship Jehovah was made to be a Baal, but because by these images also the worship of Jehovah was often mingled with the formal service of Baal, and hence the prophets Hosea and Amos speak so much of Baal-worship at a time when the calf-worship only prevailed in the kingdom of Israel, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 9—11.—The proper worship of Baal was first introduced into Samaria by Ahab (xvi. 31 f.), whence it was also transplanted into Judah.

Movers i. p. q. p. 560 ff. first opened the way to a correct view of the אֲשֵׁרִים but did not pursue it to its close. By striking arguments he refuted the current opinion, brought into repute chiefly by the authority of Gesenius, that the אשרה is perfectly identical with the Sidonian Astarte, and denotes the goddess of fortune or the planet Venus, and at the same time proved, that the name Asherah in the Old Testament was not

[1] Comp. die Phöniz. i. p. 563 f., 673 etc. Movers therefore contradicts his own correct remark p. 178: "From the extirpation of the old Canaanitish Baal-worship by Samuel, 1 Sam. xvii. 4, no more mention is made of it in the historical books of the Old Testament for several centuries; it was quite expelled from Israel, from the greater as well as from the lesser kingdom, and even in the idolatry of Solomon no Baal is found, 1 Ki. xi. 15 ff.; 2 Ki. xxiii. 13 ff. There was also among the kings of Judah the worship of many gods, 1 Ki. xiv. 22 ff., xv. 12 ff., but not that of Baal, and among the Samaritans the worship of the calves only, 'the sin of Jeroboam,' was always censured, 1 Ki. xii. 28, xv. 26, 30, 34, xvi. 2, 7, 26."

derived from the nature of this Divinity, but denoted it as an idol, and indeed an idol of wood, because words are always used of its removal and destruction, that signify burning, hewing, felling (גָּדַע, כָּרַת, שָׂרַף), p. 562 ff.—"a towering pillar of wood or a straight trunk of a tree, the boughs and top of which were lopped off, and which, planted on the heights and other idolatrous places of worship of the ancient Israelites always or at least usually beside other deities, was worshipped as a symbol of the Canaanitish or Phœnician goddess of nature" (p. 568.) Then אשׁרה also often signified the *numen* itself, which was worshipped in the hewn tree (p. 573.) This reasoning is in the main correct. אשׁרים in the *plur.* never denotes deities, gods, or idols, but Canaanitish figures of wood, particularly towering wooden pillars, as clearly appears,[1] partly from the

[1] Very doubtful, on the contrary, is the second remark of Movers, that the אֲשֵׁרָה was sometimes also a green tree or a grove, or even a Phallus. Deut. xvi. 21 certainly seems to favour the first meaning: "thou shalt not plant thee אֲשֵׁרָה כָּל־עֵץ near unto the altar of Jehovah," where Movers, p. 572, renders, "an Asherah of all kinds of trees," but the *sing.* favours the other rendering, "of all kinds of wood." Farther, נטע to plant may also be used of the setting up of a pillar in the ground, as it occurs Eccl. xii. 11 of the driving of a pin, and Dan. xi. 45 of the pitching of a tent, the pins of which are fastened in the ground. For the figurative use of נטע in this place speaks also the comparison with תָּקִים מַצֵּבָה v. 22, according to which נטע in opposition to הקים signifies only the sinking into the earth, as the latter denotes the erecting on or over it. Decisive, however, is the circumstance that in all the other places of the Old Testament the אשרים are mentioned only as figures made, erected, built, set up by men, the proofs of which Gesen. has already given in the *thes.* i. 162, and nowhere is a trace to be found that they were growing trees planted by men. Movers certainly refers, p. 574, to the Asherah cut down by Gideon (Judg. vi.), which was the terebinth mentioned v. 11, because Gideon erected a new altar instead of the old in the place, where the angel sat, under the terebinth, after he with the ten servants had cut down the Asherah. But it is not found in the Biblical text, either that Gideon built the altar under the terebinth under which the angel sat—according to v. 26 he must have built it rather עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמָּעוֹז הַזֶּה probably on a rising ground which served for a stronghold—or that the altar of Baal, which Gideon destroyed, was under the terebinth, or finally that Gideon needed ten men to cut down the Asherah alone, but Gideon took ten men with him to be able to execute in one

expressions used for their removal, partly from their connection with the חַמָּנִים Is. xvii. 8, xxvii. 9; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 7, partly from other proofs adduced by Movers of their being usual among the Canaanites. In order, however, to be able to decide farther, to what deity these figures were consecrated, we must first determine the relation of the אֲשֵׁרִים to the עַשְׁתָּרוֹת. For even if the distinction of the אשרה from the Sidonian Astarte (עַשְׁתֹּרֶת) is well-founded (comp. on xi. 5); yet it cannot again be wrongly imagined that there is no difference between עַשְׁתָּרוֹת and אֲשֵׁרוֹת. For if we compare Judg. ii. 3 "the Israelites served Baal and Ashtaroth," with Judg. iii. 7, "the Israelites served Baalim and Asheroth," the identity of the two can admit of no doubt. But may we at once identify אֲשֵׁרוֹת with אֲשֵׁרִים? In favour of this, besides the two passages of Chronicles, appears to be the circumstance, that mention is made in the Pentateuch as in the books of Kings and Chronicles only of Asherim, never of Ashtaroth (as idols or gods), in the books of Judges and Samuel, on the contrary, only of Ashtaroth never of Asherim. But this fact has its ground not so much in a peculiar speech usage of these books as in the diversity of the thing itself. עַשְׁתָּרוֹת denotes never mere idols or figures of gods, but, as its constant connection with הַבַּעַל and הַבְּעָלִים in all the passages, Judg. ii. 13, x. 6, 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4, xii. 10, shows, the nature-goddess of the Canaanites, standing beside Baal and Baalim, in its different modifications. Nor is אֲשֵׁרוֹת used in Chronicles as altogether equivalent to אֲשֵׁרִים.[1] But as between אֲשֵׁרוֹת and

night the whole works committed to him by Jehovah, the destruction of the altar of Baal, the cutting down of the Asherah beside it, the building of a new altar to Jehovah, the slaying and making ready of the oxen for the burnt-offering, the cleaving of the felled Asherah into faggots for the offering, and the making of the offering itself, vv. 25—28. Thus every ground fails for the assumption, that the Asherah found at the altar of Baal was the terebinth, v. 11. As little can the opinion of Movers, that the Asherah sometime was a Phallus, be proved from the Old Testament, as מִפְלֶצֶת xv. 13, on which Movers grounds it, signifies neither *pudendum*, nor a Phallus, comp. the remarks on the passage.

[1] In 2 Chr. xxxiii. 3 Manasseh "reared up altars for Baalim and made אֲשֵׁרוֹת and worshipped all the host of heaven," etc. אשרות denotes not idols in general but a statue of Asherah, as appears incon-

אֲשֵׁרִים, so between אֲשֵׁרִים and the sing. אֲשֵׁרָה is a distinction to be made. אשרה in the sing. denotes *(a.)* the idol of the nature-goddess of the Canaanites, generally, indeed, consisting only of a pillar, thus Deut. xvi. 21; Judg. vi. 25, 26, 28, 30;[1] *(b.)* the goddess of the Tyrians or Phœnicians[2]

trovertibly from the parallel passage 2 Ki. xxi. 3, Manasseh "reared up altars for Baal and made an אֲשֵׁרָה as did Ahab king of Israel," etc., comp. with v. 7, "and he set the graven image (פֶּסֶל) of the Asherah that he made in the house" of the Lord. The plural אֲשֵׁרוֹת denotes after the analogy of the *plur.* בעלים the plurality of conceptions of the one Asherah, that were included in its image.—In the other passage 2 Chr. xix. 3 also, where the prophet Jehu says to Jehoshaphat, " . . . nevertheless there are good things found in thee, in that thou hast taken away (בִּעַרְתָּ) the אֲשֵׁרוֹת out of the land," we are not to be led by the apparently parallel 2 Chr. xvii. 6, Jehoshaphat "took away the Bamoth and the אֲשֵׁרִים out of Judah," into the mistake of explaining the two words as synonymous, for the two passages are not really parallel; in the words כִּי-בִעַרְתָּ הָאֲשֵׁרוֹת the prophet includes all that Jehoshaphat had done for the extirpation of idolatry out of Judah, whereas xvii. 6, the removal of the high places and altars only is mentioned, but Jehoshaphat had besides exterminated the קְדֵשִׁים out of his kingdom, xxii. 47. Accordingly אשרות stands here as *pars pro toto* for gods and objects of idolatry in general. In favour of this is the use of the verb בִּעֵר, which is never used of the destruction or annihilation of the Asherim, and must be understood in the meaning prevailing in the Pentateuch of the extermination of the ungodly from the theocracy (Deut. xiii. 6, xvii. 7, 12, xix. 19, xxi. 21, xxii. 21, 22, 24, xxiv. 7) in our passage, as well as in 2 Ki. xxii. 47, xxiii. 24, of the extermination of idols and idolaters.

[1] To this also probably belongs את האשרה 2Ki. xviii. 4, for which in the parallel 2 Chr. xxxi. 1 stands the plur. אֲשֵׁרִים, so that האשרה is here to be taken *collective* (comp. Mov. 1. p. q. p. 563) and is synonymous with אשרים, as it is not recorded, that Ahaz set up a pillar of the Tyrian Asherah in Jerusalem.

[2] This Tyrian goddess certainly bears the same name with the idol of the old Canaanitish nature-goddess, אֲשֵׁרָה *recta*, Ὀρθία from אָשַׁר to be straight (comp. Mov. p. 566), but must however be distinct from it, as the introduction of the worship of Baal and Ashera by Jezebel into Israel is represented as a new form of idolatry (comp. Mov. p. 9 and 178), even if it was closely related to the Canaanitish nature-goddess, as may be inferred partly from the consanguinity of the Tyrians and the Canaanites of Palestine, partly from this, that even before

standing beside Baal, 1 Ki. xv. 13; 2 Chr. xv. 19; 1 Ki. xviii. 19; 2 Ki. xxi. 7, xxiii. 4, 7; *(c.)* the image or statue of this goddess, 1 Ki. xvi. 33; 2 Ki. xiii. 6, xvii. 16, xxi. 3, xxiii. 6, 15. Of these three significations the first only is transferred from the sing. to the plur. אשׁרים which, with the exception of v. 15, where the word is used in the most general sense of idols of every sort, always denotes only the idols (pillars) of the nature-goddess of the Canaanites in its different modifications. The worship of these idols was practised by the Israelites, but mostly, as often that of Baal, in connection with the worship of Jehovah. The possibility of this connection is presupposed in the Pentateuch, and therefore it is forbidden, Deut. xvi. 21, to plant "an Asherah near unto the altar of Jehovah." Such a connection certainly appears not so easy as that of Baal with Jehovah, but is sufficiently explained on the one side by this, that the Asherah was nowhere worshipped in general for itself alone, but among all the Canaanites only in connection with Baal and subordinate to him, and thus followed from the Baal-worship almost of itself, and on the other side from this, that the people might have no clear preception for the most part of the ideas connected with the several idols.[1]

The phrase "on every high hill and under every green tree," by which the general propagation of these idols through the land is expressed (2 Ki. xvi. 4, xvii. 10), is borrowed from Deut. xii. 2, whence also Jeremiah has taken it, Jer. ii. 20, iii. 6, xvii. 2. The choice of hills for places of worship, of which traces are found in many heathen nations, comp. Gesenuis pref. to Gramberg's Religionsid. d. A.T. i. p. xiv. ff., had its ground in the widespread belief, that there man is nearer the deity and heaven. But the green trees are connected with the sacred groves so popular among heathen nations, comp. Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 534, which not only attune the heart to devout elevation by their solemn

Ahab some traces of the worship of the Tyrian goddess Asherah are found in the kingdom of Judah (xv. 13.) The worship of Asherah was also in the course of time confounded with that of the Sidonian Astarte, as appears from this, that the Israelites in the time of the Judges down to Samuel served Ashtaroth with Baalim, and Ashtaroth is identified with Asheroth.

[1] The older opinions concerning the Asherah are enumerated by Gesen. *Thes.* i. p. 162 f.

stillness, but also by their shady darkness withdrew the sinful practices of idolatry from the eyes of the multitude.—Movers p. 579 ff. wrongly applies these passages to prove, that the Asherah was sometimes a green tree or trunk.[1]

V. 24. "And there was also paramours in the land." קָדֵשׁ the consecrated, that is, the paramour. So are those called, who, in a fit of religious frenzy, made themselves eunuchs in honour of the Canaanitish nature-goddess, and were called *Galli* by the Romans,[2] comp. Movers i. p. q. p. 678 ff. and Gesen. *thes*. iii. 1196 f. The sojourn of such people in the land presupposes the wide propagation of the Canaanitish worship of nature, which is also indicated by the enhancing וְגַם. Moreover we are not so to understand the words as if the Israelites had taken part in this sin contrary to the law, Deut. xxiii. 18; the קדשים

[1] Movers certainly acknowledges, that here the Asherah is different from the green trees, but combines with these passages Is. lvii. 5, i. 29, and thence draws the proof above given, since he renders the words הַנֵּחָמִים בָּאֵלִים וגו' (lvii. 5), "who are kindled in the terebinths under every green tree," as if there had been terebinths under every green tree!! That terebinths were even worshipped as idols follows from neither of these passages; for even if אֵלִים (lvii. 5), as well as אילים (i. 29), must signify terebinths, these words can only be rendered, "who are hot beside the terebinths" (Ewald), or, "who are burnt in the terebinths under every green tree," that is, under every tree of their idol-groves (Knobel), or, *in lucis qui his arboribus constant* (Maur.), so that the words express nothing more than that the shady terebinths were regarded as favourite places for the practice of idolatry. It is evidently more correct, however, to understand אֵלִים of the gods "who are burnt for the gods" (Gesen., Hitz.) or, "beside the gods under every green tree" (Umbr.)

[2] Of the קדשים Jerome says in a passage quoted by Movers, p. 683: *Hi sunt quos hodie Romæ, matri non Deorum sed dæmoniorum servientes, Gallos vocant, eo quod de hac gente (?) Romani truncatos libidine in honorem Atyos, quem eunuchum dea meretrix fecerat, sacerdotes illius manciparint. . . . Sciendum autem quod in præsenti Cadesoth, meretrices,* ἱερεῖς, *id est, sacerdotes Priapo mancipatas vocet. In aliis autem locis viros exsectos libidine, Cadesim legimus. Aquila autem* ἐνηλλαγμένους *interpretans, id est, mutatos, hoc ostendere voluit, quod suam naturam mutaverint, et de viris facti sint feminæ: Symmachus* ἑταιρίδας, *proprie meretrices, appellavit; Septuaginta* τετελεσμένους, *id est, consecratos et initiatos, ut cultores idolorum ostenderent: Theodotion* κεχωρισμένους, *id est, a populo segregatos, qui sibi videbantur a vulgo aliquid plus habere. Comment. ad Hos. tom.* iii. *p.* 1261 *sq.*

were Canaanites, who appeared[1] in Judah with the prevalence of idolatry, and were tolerated until Asa and Jehoshphat cleansed the land of them as well as other abominations of idols, xv. 12, xxii. 47.

Vv. 25—28. The sinking into heathen abominations was soon followed by the punishment, that Judah was delivered into the power of the heathen. Shishak, king of Egypt, with a powerful host invades the land, conquers all the fenced cities, advances to Jerusalem, and would certainly have made an end of the kingdom of Judah, had not the Lord, in consequence of the humiliation of the king and rulers of the people before him, effected by the warning of the prophet Shemaiah, relented and averted this issue, so that Shishak, after taking the capital, contented himself with carrying off the treasures of the temple and the royal palace. Comp. 2 Chr. xii., where this military expedition is related at large.[2] Shishak (שִׁישַׁק) is in consequence of the recent discoveries in Egypt undoubtedly the first king of the twenty-second dynasty (the Bubastite) called *Sesonchis* by Jul. Afric., *Sesonchosis* by Euseb., Sheshonk on the monuments.[3] In

[1] "They appear here," Mov. p. 679, correctly remarks, "as strangers among the Israelites, and are those *cinaedi*, especially infamous from the times of the Roman empire, who went about everywhere begging for the Syrian goddess *(qui per plateas et oppida cymbalis et crotalis personantes, Deamque Syriam circumferentes mendicare compellunt Deam matrem. Apul, met.* viii. p. 182. *Mendicantes Deos vicatim ducunt. Min. Felix, Octavius* p. 355), and even to Augustine's time, as a remnant of the Phenician worship, wandered about the streets of Carthage for alms (*de civit Dei*. vii. 26)" etc.

[2] Rationalist criticism has certainly attacked the historical truth of this account, but in such a manner, that de Wette and Gramberg objects to the writer of Chronicles, that to save the honour of religion, he has passed over the accounts of the Books of Kings concerning the idolatry of Rehoboam, comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 381 f., while Winer (bibl. R.W. ii. p. 300) asserts the direct contrary, that in the Books of Kings nothing is said of Rehoboam's participation in idolatrous worship, for which he is blamed in Chronicles, whereby this criticism refutes itself.

[3] The opinion of Marsham, Clericus, and others, that Shishak is Sesostris has been refuted by Perizonius, *origg. Aeg. c.* 8, and Buddeus *hist. eccl. V. T.* i. 978 ff. Comp. also my apolog. Vers. p. 330 ff.—Since Champollion, precis du systeme hieroglyph. p. 204 f., read the name Shishonk on the bas relief at Karnak, which represents Sesonchis, as he drags to the feet of the Theban trinity the heads of more

plundering Jerusalem he also took with him the golden shields made by Solomon (x. 16), instead of which Rehoboam then caused brazen ones to be made for his body guard (v. 27.)—On תָּא guard room comp. Hävern. on Ezek. xl. 7.

V. 30. "And there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all the days" (of their reign.) As nothing is said of open war, and Rehoboam is also warned by the prophet Shemaiah against fighting with the Israelites (xii. 22 ff.), this statement can only be understood of the warlike inclination and hostile position of the two sovereigns towards one another.

---

## CHAPTER XV. 1—31.

### REIGNS OF THE KINGS ABIJAM AND ASA OF JUDAH, VV. 1—24. AND OF NADAB OF ISRAEL, VV. 25—32.

Vv. 1—8. *Reign of Abijam.* Rehoboam's son and successor is called 2 Chr. xi. 22, xiii. 1 etc., אֲבִיָּה, xiii. 20 f., אֲבִיָּהוּ, in this book אֲבִיָּם with a ם attached to several proper names, to which *Simonis Onomast.* p. 257, assigns an intensive meaning. V. 2. "And his mother's name was Maachah, the daughter of Abishalom." So she is called also 2 Chr. xi. 20 f.; on the contrary, 2 Chr. xiii. 2, Michaiah, daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. If Abishalom (אֲבִישָׁלוֹם) or Absalom be the well known son of David, which can scarcely be doubted, as this name is a rare one, occurring again of no other person in the Old Testament, and Rehoboam chose his wives from the royal race, 2 Chr. xi. 18—20, Maachah must have been not a daughter but only a granddaughter of Absalom, that is, a daughter of Thamar, who alone of Absalom's children outlived her father (2 Sam. xviii. 18,

than thirty conquered nations, among whom is found a *Judahamalek* with a remarkably Jewish physiognomy, his identity with Sisak or Shishok can no longer lie under any doubt, and is therefore now universally admitted; comp. M. de Bovet, des dynasties Ægypt., Paris 1829. p. 89, Greppo, essai sur le syst. hierogl. p. 173 ff., Heeren. Ideen ii. 2, p. 325, Winer, bibl. R.W. ii. p. 368 and 547, de Wette, hebr. jüd. Archæol. p. 44 f. *Archinard, chronol.* p. 50 etc.

xiv. 27). Thamar married Uriel of Gibeah, and bare him this Maachah, who is also called Michaiah, whether it be that she assumed this name first as queen-mother, or had received it earlier from some cause to us unknown. Comp. on the great mutability and variation of names in the East, Hengstenb. Beitr. ii., p. 271 ff., Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. i., p. 63, and Ranke, histor. Unters. üb. d. Pent. i. p 247 ff.

V. 3—5. As sovereign, Abijam resembled his father; although he, v. 15, made donations to the temple in compensation for those carried off by Shishak, yet his heart was divided between the worship of Jehovah and that of idols, it was not שָׁלֵם with the Lord, comp. xi. 4, xiv. 22, so that God only for the sake of David did not reject him, but allowed the throne to descend to his son, v. 4, comp. xi. 13—36. "Save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite" (2 Sam. xi., xii.), in which David had grievously sinned, but sincerely repented and obtained forgiveness from the Lord, Ps. xxxi. lii. On v. 5, comp. farther xiv. 8.

V. 6. "And there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all the days of his life," that is, the hostile relation existing between Rehoboam and Jeroboam (xiv. 30) continued also in the reign of Abijam. Thus understood, as the words כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּיו (not כָּל־יְמֵיהֶם as in v. 16) demand, this notice loses all its strangeness and agrees well with the statement v. 7, that there was war also between Abijam and Jeroboam.[1] For under Abijam broke out a great open war, in which Jeroboam sustained a severe defeat, as is circumstantially related 2 Chr. xiii. 3—20.[2]

Vv. 9—24. *Asa's reign.* As Asa ascended the throne in the 20th year of Jeroboam, his father, who began to reign in his

[1] It is not necessary therefore either to change the name Rehoboam (v. 6) into Abijam, as Castal. and Dathe, referring to the Syr. version and 5 *codd.* in Kennicot propose, or to omit v. 6, for which the *cod. Vatic.* and the Arab. version are quoted, especially as these authorities are too weak to be able to stand as valid testimonies against the Masor. text and the other old versions.

[2] The grounds on which de Wette opposed the historical truth of this narrative in Chronicles, are refuted in my apolog. Vers. p. 444 ff. Only the numbers, given in vv. 3 and 17, of the troops on both sides, and of the Israelites slain, are too great, which arises however not in consequence of intentional exaggeration, but from a false resolution of he numerical letters into words. See my apol. Vers. § 37.

18th year, must have reigned, not full three years, but only two years and some months.—v. 10. וְשֵׁם אִמּוֹ וגו—Maachah was properly the grandmother of Asa, comp. v. 2, but is named queen mother, because in the first year of his reign she took her place as גְּבִירָה (v. 13), that is, Sultana Walide, comp. on xiv. 11.—Vv. 11—14. As king, Asa walked in the footsteps of his pious ancestor David; he removed the paramours, and all the idol-abominations introduced by his fathers, deposed even his grandmother from the dignity of queen, because she had made an idol of Asherah, and caused this idol to be cut down and burned in the valley of Kedron. He could not, however, completely carry out his reform, the high places were not removed,[1] although his heart was wholly given to the Lord, but only in the first fifteen years of his reign, comp. v. 16. מִפְלֶצֶת Jerome, *comm. ad Hos. c.* 4, explains by *simulacrum Priapi;* so Selden, *de diis Syr. syntagm.* ii., *c.* 5. Accordingly Movers i. p. q. p. 571 renders the word *pudendum,* obscene figure, and understands by it with several Rabbins a *phallus,* as a symbol of the productive and fructifying power of nature. But this signification cannot be proved from the *radix* of the word. מפלצת from פלץ *terrere, timere,* signifies only an object of terror, and thus here *simulacrum timendum:* as to the peculiar nature of this figure, however, nothing farther can be determined than that, as יִכְרֹת indicates, it was of wood.

V. 15. Asa provided for the temple also, as he deposited in the treasury of the temple the dedicated gifts of his father and his own, probably the spoil in silver, gold and vessels, which his father had taken in the great discomfiture of Jeroboam, 2 Chr. xiii. 16 f., and he himself in the conquest of the Cushites, 2 Chr. xiv. 12 f. The *Keri* קָדְשֵׁי is a bad emendation for the above correct קדשו, which is to be read קָדְשׁוֹ or more correctly perhaps קָדָשָׁיו.

[1] That this is the meaning of the oft-recurring (xxii. 44, 2 Ki. xii. 4, xiv. 4, 35) phrase וְהַבָּמוֹת לֹא־סָרוּ, appears incontrovertibly from our passage and 2 Chr. xiv. 2, comp. with 2 Chr. xv. 17, and from 2 Chr. xvii. 6, comp. with xx. 33. Comp. also my apol. Vers. p. 290, where the seeming contradiction between our verse and 2 Chr. xiv. 2, is resolved, which the older writers, for ex. Seb. Schm., J. H. Mich., Schulz, and others, have erroneously attempted to remove by distinguishing between Bamoth dedicated to Jehovah and those to idols.

V. 16—22. The state of war between Israel and Judah continued also under Asa, although after the great victory gained by Abijam over Jeroboam the kingdom of Judah had rest ten years, which Asa employed in rooting out idolatry, fortifying several cities, and strengthening his army, 2 Chr. xiv. 1—7. In the eleventh year of his reign the Cushite Zerah, with an innumerable army, invaded his dominions, but by the help of the Lord, was totally defeated, 2 Chr. xiv. 8—14, whereupon Asa, encouraged by the prophet Azariah the son of Oded, proceeded with fresh zeal to the extirpation of the traces of idolatry still remaining in his kingdom, then renewed the altar of burnt-offering before the porch of the temple, and in the fifteenth year of his reign, kept a grand festival of thanksgiving and joy before the Lord with his whole people at Jerusalem, 2 Chr. xv. 1—15. In the following year, or the 36th year after the separation of the kingdoms, 2 Chr. xvi. 1, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 292, Baasha commenced hostilities by advancing towards Judah, and proceeding to fortify the town of Ramah, which was not more than six Roman miles from Jerusalem, and commanded the way to the capitol. הָרָמָה is, according to v. 22, the Ramah lying in the tribe of Benjamin not far from Gibeah (Jos. xviii. 25; Judg. xix. 3; Is. x. 29), different from the Ramah of Samuel on Mount Ephraim, with which it is erroneously confounded by Winer bibl. R.W. ii. p. 356, comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 213, and Thenius in Käuffer's Studien ii. p. 134; now a wretched village *er Râm*, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 566. Lying so entirely in the heart of the tribe of Benjamin, and in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, Ramah cannot have been either a border town or have belonged to the kingdom of Israel, as Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 1. p. 305 supposes. Baasha, therefore, in occupying[1] and fortifying this place, must have had in view not merely to prevent his subjects from passing into the kingdom of Judah, but obviously intended to gain a firm footing in Judah, and cut off the free

[1] The occupying of Ramah is not indeed expressly mentioned, but we may infer it with certainty partly from the situation of the place, partly from the words וַיַּעַל . . . עַל־יְהוּדָה v. 17, which often denote a hostile invasion, for example Is. vii. 1. Thus also Josephus has correctly understood our passage.

communication of king Asa towards the north (לְבִלְתִּי תֵּת יֹצֵא וגו', v. 17.) To avert this danger Asa endeavours to move Benhadad the Syrian king at Damascus, by the transmission of the treasure found in the temple and the palace, to break the covenant made with Baasha and become his own confederate, in which he succeeds, so that Benhadad throws an army into the kingdom of Israel, and by the conquest of several cities in northern Galilee compels king Baasha to abandon the fortification of Ramah and retire to his own residence, Tirzah; whereupon Asa summoned all Judah and caused them to remove the materials in stone and wood laid down for the fortification of Ramah, and fortify therewith Geba and Mizpah.[1]—V. 18. Three kings of Damascus bear the name Benhadad; the here mentioned son of Tabrimmon and grandson of Hezion is the first of this name. According to v. 19 his father was also king and contemporary with Abijam; but whether his grandfather was king is at least not so certain as many believe; from the present passage at all events it does not appear with certainty, as מֶלֶךְ אֲרָם, v. 18, only applies to Benhadad. Comp. the note on xi. 24. בֶּן־הֲדַד is moreover only a royal title, and signifies son of the sun or sun-god. Hadad is, according to *Macrob. Saturn.* i. 24, the name of the supreme divinity of the Syrians, the sun, hence according to *Nicol. Damasc.*, ten Syrian kings bore this name, comp. Winer, bibl. R.W. i. p. 178, and Movers, Phöniz. i. p. 196. How long he reigned is unknown; his successor in Ahab's time bore the same name, xx. 34.—V. 20. Among the cities taken by Benhadad in the land of Naphtali is עִיּוֹן, Ijon, perhaps the same with Ajun, (عجون) in the vicinity of Abil and Dan (v. Raum. Pal. p. 128), or, according to Robinson's conjecture, to be sought in the district Merj 'Ayun (مرج عيون), Pal. iii. p. 611. Abel-beth-

[1] Before the powerful army of the Cushites Asa had sought and obtained help from the Lord; before the invasion of the Israelites, he seeks help from the Syrians. This change of conduct is perhaps partly explained by this, that his army was considerably weakened by the battle fought with the Cushites notwithstanding his victory (2 Chr. xiv. 9), though his want of confidence in the power of the Lord is by no means thereby justified, still less his harsh and unrighteous conduct towards the prophet Hanani, whom he cast into prison when he rebuked him for the confidence placed in the Syrians rather than in Jehovah (2 Chr. xvi. 7—10.)

maachah or Abel-maim, 2 Chr. xvi. 4, also called merely Abel, 2 Sam. xx. 14—18, is probably Abil (ابل), Abela of Euseb., lying to the north of Merom, comp. v. Raum. p. 117 f., and Winer bibl. R.W. i. p. 4.—כָּל־כִּנְּרוֹת, all Cinneroth, that is, all the land of Cinnereth, as the LXX. have rendered. כִּנֶּרֶת is a town, Jos. xix. 35, from which the sea of Galilee and the region around it have obtained their name.[1]—V. 21. Tirzah, according to v. 15 and xiv. 17, the residence of the kings of Israel till the time of Omri, is perhaps to be sought in Tersa, which must have lain, according to Brocardus and Breytenbach, twelve miles east of Samaria, comp. Ysbr. v. Hamelsv. bibl. Geogr. iii. p. 254, and v. Raum. Pal. p. 164.—V. 22. The adverbial use of אֵין נָקִי, *nemine immuni i.e. nemine excepto* is peculiar to our passage, but follows from passages such as Deut. xxiv. 5; Num. xxxii. 22.—Geba of Benjamin and Mizpah were situated near Rama of Benjamin; but the situation of Geba is not fully ascertained, as the Jeba (جبع) lying east of er Ram (الرام) is in all probability the Gibeah of Saul, comp. Rob. ii. p. 325 f. Mizpah no doubt still exists in the present Neby Samwil (نبي سمويل) below Gibeon, two hours north of Jerusalem, comp. Rob. ii. p. 361 f.

Vv. 23, 24. Of the other acts of Asa, besides what has been already mentioned in Chronicles, nothing farther is recorded, except that, in addition to the harshness he displayed in his conduct towards the seer Hanani in the latter years of his reign, he oppressed some of his people, and that in the 39th year of his

[1] Movers in the Krit. Unters. ü. d. Chron. p. 93 renders: "all the Cinneroth in the whole land of Naphtali," according to which there had been several cities of this name in the land of Naphtali, and infers, because the topography of Palestine knows nothing of such, that the reading is corrupt, and that with the parallel passage 2 Chr. xvi. 4 כָּל־מִסְכְּנוֹת, all magazine cities, is to be read. But the supposition here made, that the plural form כִּנְּרוֹת also is used of the city, cannot be proved; for Jos. xi. 2 כנרות may denote either the sea or the district of this name, and in Jos. xii. 3 יָם is expressed with it. The deviation of Chron. arises from the free use of older sources.—The עַל כָּל־אֶרֶץ נַפְתָּלִי, "in all the land of Naphtali," belongs not merely to כָּל־כִּנְּרוֹת but to all the previously mentioned towns.

reign he was sorely diseased in his feet, applied for help, not to the Lord, but to the physicians, 2 Chr. xvi. 10—12, and thus became the longer the more estranged in heart from the true God.

V. 25—31. *Reign of Nadab of Israel*, of whom nothing is recorded, but that Nadab walked in the ways and sins of his father (comp. xii. 26—33), and in the second year of his reign was slain by Baasha of the tribe of Issachar, who conspired against him at the siege of Gibbethon, a town occupied by the Philistines. Gibbethon (גִּבְּתוֹן) assigned by Joshua to the tribe of Dan, but transferred to the Levites (Jos. xix. 44, xxi. 23), probably lay close upon the borders of the Philistines, and had soon therefore been again occupied by the Philistines, from whom the Israelites under Nadab and Elah (xvi. 16) endeavoured to wrest it by siege, but, as it appears, without effect.—V. 29 ff. As soon as Baasha ascended the throne, he destroyed the whole house of Jeroboam, and thereby fulfilled the saying of the prophet Ahijah concerning Jeroboam, xiv. 7 ff.—לֹא־הִשְׁאִיר כָּל־נְשָׁמָה, "he left not to Jeroboam any that had breath," denotes the extirpation of every soul, comp. Jos. xi. 11—14.—These verses moreover contain several proofs, that the incomplete years of the kings are always given in full; for if Nadab ascended the throne in the second year of (Asa v. 25), but Asa in the twentieth year of Jeroboam (v. 9), Jeroboam cannot have reigned full twenty-two years, but only twenty-one and some months; and if Baasha succeeded Nadab on the throne in the third year of Asa (vv. 28—33), Nadab also cannot have reigned two years (v. 25), but not much more than one and a half years, or perhaps even a shorter time.

---

## CHAPTER XV. 32—XVI. 28.

### REIGNS OF BAASHA, XV. 32—XVI. 7; ELAH, VV. 8—14; ZIMRI, VV. 15—22; AND OMRI, VV. 23—28, KINGS OF ISRAEL.

Vv. 32—34. Of the reign of Baasha are merely stated its relation to the kingdom of Judah, v. 32, its duration and its spirit,

vv. 33, 34. Now although the ground of scantiness of historical detail lies in the character of theocratic historical composition, which proposes to record only what is important for the development of the theocracy, yet here at the same time the excerptive character of our books again comes to view, partly in the notice already given v. 16 and here v. 32 repeated word for word, taken there from the annals of the kingdom of Judah, here from those of Israel, and indeed improperly placed before vv. 33 and 34, partly in the fixed forms for characterising the several reigns, vv. 33, 34, which are constantly repeated.

Chap. xvi. 1—4. The division of chapters is here regulated not according to the reign of the king, but according to the prophetic sentence, by which the fate of the reigning dynasty was decided.—The prophet Jehu, who announced its fall to the house of Baasha, was a son of Hanani, who acted under Asa in the kingdom of Judah, 2 Chr. xvi. 7 ff. His sentence on the race of Baasha (vv. 2—4) is *mutatis mutandis* copied after that of Ahijah on Jeroboam (xiv. 7—11.)[1]—הֲרִימֹתִיךָ מִן־הֶעָפָר *erexi te in supremum gradum de statu infimo.* Vatabl.

Vv. 5—7. The notice v. 7 is at first sight so strange, that several Rabbins thought that a new prophecy is here conveyed. This is an error; v. 7 contains only a supplementary remark, as Seb. Schm. has rightly observed, and signifies: "And that word of the Lord concerning Baasha and his house came by Jehu not only on account of the evil that he did in the eyes of Jehovah, in provoking him by the work of his hands and being like the house of Jeroboam, as already said, but also because he had slain it (the house of Jeroboam)." To this last reason applies again the remark made on xi. 29, that Ahijah's prophecy concerning the extirpation of Jeroboam's house (xiv. 9 ff.) gave Baasha no

[1] Corn. a Lap. makes here the appropriate remark: *Mira fuit perversitas et stoliditas regum Israel, quod cum viderent jussu Dei plane everti familias regum præcedentium ob cultum vitulorum, imo ipsi easdem everterent, ipsi tamen eosdem vitulos colerent et colendos proponerent populo, ne ad templum et Asa regem Jerusalem rediret: esto reclamarent prophetæ et excidium eis minarentur. Nimirum diabolus et ambitio regnandi excæcabat et dementabat eos. Hinc justo Dei judicio factum est, ut omnes sibi invicem fuerint carnifices: Baasa enim fuit carnifex filiorum Jerobeam, Zambri fuit carnifex filiorum Baasæ, Zambri vero carnifex fuit Amri.*

right to take upon him of his own will to be its executioner. From the very fact that he continued the illegal worship of the calves and therefore the sin of Jeroboam, it is manifest, that in the extirpation of the family of Jeroboam he acted not by a commission from God but in compliance with his own sinful passions.

Vv. 8—14. *Reign of Elah.* As Elah became king in the 26th year of Asa, his father Baasha (xv. 33), who came to the throne in the third year of Asa, cannot have reigned twenty-four, but only a little more than twenty-three years. Elah also kept the throne not full two years; for in the 27th year of Asa, Zimri, the captain of half his chariots, conspired against him, and not only slew himself as he lay drunken in the house of Arza the prefect of his palace, but also, after he wrested the sovereignty to himself, rooted out his whole house to the last man. V. 11. "He left him not one . . . וְגֹאֲלָיו וְרֵעֵהוּ, "neither his kinsmen," who might have avenged his death, "nor his friend."—V. 13 אֶל כָּל־חַטֹּאות וגו׳ "with respect to all the sins."—בְּהַבְלֵיהֶם with their vanities, that is, their idolatrous worship.

Vv. 15—20. Zimri also did not long enjoy the sovereignty; as soon as the army which besieged Gibbethon (xv. 27) learned his conspiracy and usurpation, it proclaimed in the camp Omri (עָמְרִי), the captain of the host, king over Israel, who also immediately with all the people broke up from Gibbethon to besiege Tirzah. But when Zimri saw that the town was taken, he betook himself to the royal palace and burned it and himself in it, like Sardanapalus *Justini hist.* i. 3.—V. 18. וַיִּשְׂרֹף עָלָיו וגו׳ "and burned the king's house over him with fire."—The 19th verse is connected with וַיָּמֹת only; "and so he died on account of his sins," etc., that is, he met with this end in punishment of his sins.

Vv. 21, 22. With the death of Zimri, however, Omri did not yet attain to the sole sovereignty. The people divided into two parties, of which the one wished to make Tibni, the son of Ginath, king, the other Omri, until after four years (comp. v. 15 f. with v. 23) the party of Omri gained the superiority over the followers of Tibni, and the latter died, whereupon Omri became sole king in the 31st year of Asa. According to Josephus

*Antiq.* viii. 12, 5) Tibni was slain, but this is not definitely implied in וַיָּמָת, and ויחזק is of too general an import to warrant us in concluding that Tibni with his followers was conquered by Omri and his party in an open battle. חָזַק is here construed with an *accus.* instead of עַל in the sense, to overpower, as in Jer. xx. 7.

Vv. 23--28. After Omri had attained to the undisputed possession of the sovereignty, he formed the resolution to change his residence from Tirza, where Zimri had burned the royal palace. He purchased therefore a "fair round swelling hill" north-west of mount Ebal for two talents of silver (3235 rixd., £684), of Shemer, and built on it the city, which from the former possessor of the hill obtained the name of שֹׁמְרוֹן Samaria, for the capital of the kingdom and the residence of the Israelitish monarchs, which it continued to be from the sixth year of the sole sovereignty of Omri to the overthrow of the kingdom. On the situation and history of this city comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 363 ff. In other respects the reign of Omri resembled that of his untheocratic predecessors, whose sins he only continued and exceeded. The twelve years of his reign are, according to v. 29, comp. with vv. 15 and 23, to be reckoned from his rebellion against Zimri, so that he possessed the sole sovereignty only eight years.

*Second Epoch.*—From the beginning of the reign of Ahab to the deaths of Joram of Israel, and Ahaziah of Judah. Chap. xvi. 29—2 Ki. x.

During this period, embracing only thirty-four years, the history of the kings of Judah retires so much into the back ground of that of the kingdom of Israel, as to be almost treated only as an appendix to it, and in the history the action of the prophets so far surpasses and prevails over the government of the kings, that we seem to have before us a history of the prophets rather than of the kings. The reason of this lies in the nature of the case. The kingdom of Judah, not only by the connection and alliance of Jehoshaphat with Ahab, as his son married Ahab's daughter, lost the greater part of the blessing, which the long theocratically righteous administration of this pious prince had brought on his country, but was also, by taking part in the external struggles of Israel with the Syrians, and by the inclina-

tion of Joram and Ahaziah to the worship of Baal, so implicated in the political and religious troubles of the kingdom of Israel, that its development during this period was almost entirely dependent on the history of Israel. But in this kingdom a fierce battle was fought between the theocratic principle and the idolatry introduced by Ahab and Jezebel, in which certainly the worship of idols finally sank, but still the lawful pure worship of Jehovah was not able to assert its sovereignty, so that this great spiritual conflict brought as little lasting blessing to the kingdom as such, as the several victories of Ahab and Joram over the Syrians secured to it external peace and rest from its oppressors. In order to prevent the apostasy that was spreading by the elevation of Baal-worship to be the predominant state-religion in Israel, the Lord raised up the most powerful and vigorous of all the prophets, the prophet Elijah, with his fiery zeal, who, personally under Ahab and Ahaziah (xvii.—2 Ki. ii.), and indirectly in the person of his successor Elisha under Joram (2 Ki. iii.—ix.), laboured so effectually for the progress of the theocracy, that the action of these two prophets forms as well the spiritual acme as externally the most important and influential period in the history of Israel.

Vv. 29—34. *Reign of Ahab.* With this commences the turning-point for the kingdom of Israel. While Ahab's predecessors contented themselves with continuing in the sin of Jeroboam, that is, the worship of Jehovah under the symbol of the ox, Ahab marries the daughter of Ethbaal king of Tyre,[1] the ungodly Jezebel, and to please her raises the Tyrian Baal-worship, and thus a formal idolatry, instead of the worship of Jehovah to the supremacy in his kingdom, builds in Samaria a temple and altar to Baal, erects an Asherah, and thus acts more wickedly than all his predecessors.—The הֲ before נָקֵל is not the

[1] Ethbaal is unquestionably the Εἰθώβαλος (or Ἰθόβαλος *Jos. Ant.* viii. 13, 1) mentioned by Menander in Joseph. c. Ap. i. 18, King of Tyre and Sidon, a priest of Astarte, who, after murdering the king Philetos, raised himself to the throne, and, as J. D. Mich. has remarked, in time and character—king-murderer and idol-priest—proves himself the father of Jezebel, who, as prophet-murderer and tyrant, introduces idolatry into Israel. When, therefore, v. 31, the marriage of Jezebel is reckoned among the grievous sins of Ahab, it is not so much because she was by birth, as by character a genuine Canaanitess (Ex. xxxiv. 16.)

article expressing the superlative (Storr, *observ. ad. anal. et synt. hebr.* p. 123), but הֲ interrogative; *num leve fuit hoc?* (J. H. Mich.) or: *num parum* ille habuit? (Maurer.)—Baal (הַבַּעַל with the def. art. *dominus κατ' ἐξοχήν*) denotes the chief male deity of the Canaanitish races, especially the Phœnicians and their descendants the Carthaginians, as well as the Babylonians, whose *Βῆλος* originally coincides with the Canaanitish Baal, a god of nature, which had its earthly substratum in the sun, not the planet Jupiter, as Gesenius, allg. Encycl. viii. 397 ff., Winer, R.W. *s.v.*, and others suppose. Baal signifies, "the sun-god, and this pre-eminently, as bearer and principle of the physical life, and of the productive propagating power of nature, which was regarded as an efflux of his essence" (Mov. Phöniz. i. p. 184), but because he bore in him the entire full idea of the deity in the nature-religions of hither Asia, men worshipped in him not merely the producing, but at the same time the preserving and destroying principle of nature, so that the idea connected with Baal was very comprehensive, and, on account of the pantheism lying at the root of polytheism, very influential, and, indeed, different at different times and in different places. Baals (in the plural number), therefore, are often mentioned in the Old Testament, and the Greeks identify Baal not only with the Olympian Zeus, but also with Saturn, as "the principle of order, unity, and necessity in the organism of the universe," and with Mars, "as the wild destructive fire, the origin of all disorder and discord in the process of nature" (Mov. i. p. q.), and often call the Tyrian Baal Hercules, but not merely on account of the similarity of representation, "with lion's skin and club" (de Wette Archæol. p. 314 f.) but as the mythical manifestation of the supreme God (Mov. p. 389.) Statues or images of Baal are not mentioned in the Old Testament, for the בְּעָלִים are not *statuae Baalis* (Gesen. *thes.* i. 224), but denote manifold conceptions of the one God (Mov. p. 175.) The older Tyrian Baal, also, was not represented by an image; two pillars only were found in his temple, the one of gold, which Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon and builder of the temple, is said to have erected to him (according to Dios and Menander in Joseph. *Antiq.* viii. 5, 3, and *c. Ap.* i. 18), the other of emerald (Herod. ii. 44.) Ahab also erected a pillar (מַצֵּבָה comp. on xiv. 23) to Baal in the temple of Baal built

by him in Samaria (2 Ki. iii. 2, x. 27.) In the later temple of Baal or Hercules at Tyre, however, was found *ex aere simalacrum ipsius Herculis, quo non facile quidquam dixerim me vidisse pulcrius (Cic. Verr.* iv. 43.) Of the worship of Baal in Israel we learn only that it was performed by a numerous priesthood, called prophets of Baal, at the head of whom stood a high-priest in Tyre, *cui honos secundus a rege erat (Justin. hist.* xviii. 4), with animal sacrifices, accompanied with enthusiastic dances, xviii. 19, 26 ff. Comp. on Baal and the Baalim, Mov. i. p. q. p. 169 ff., and de Wette, Archæol. § 232 *a.*—The phrase: "he did evil in the eyes of Jehovah more than all his predecessors," v. 30, is indeed used before, v. 25, of Omri, so that it might appear that it ought not to be too strictly urged; but if we reflect, that Ahab could scarcely have openly introduced the formal worship of Baal immediately into his kingdom, unless during the reign of his father, in the constantly increasing neglect of the worship of Jehovah the germs had been planted, which were brought to maturity by Ahab. A practical proof, nevertheless, how far all true fear of God in the mass of the people had vanished under Ahab, is furnished by the rebuilding of Jericho, attempted no doubt at the command of the king by Hiel, in whom, however, the Lord showed, that he was able to punish the despisers of his name. In the name of the Lord Joshua had laid a ban upon this city after its conquest and destruction, and pronounced a curse upon him, who should undertake to rebuild it. That this curse was literally fulfilled in Hiel is shown by v. 34, comp. with Josh. vi. 26, although it cannot be decided, how far the poetically conceived words of the curse are to be literally understood, whether so that Hiel lost only the first-born and youngest sons, the one at the beginning, and the other at the end of the erection, or with Rashi so that during the building all his sons from first to last perished. In no case, however, does the poetical character of the curse warrant us to explain it with the Rationalists, Maurer, Studer on Judg. iii. 13, Winer, R.W. i. 639, and others, as a mere *vaticinium ex eventu.* The rebuilding of Jericho consisted in the restoration of the place as a city by the erection of city walls; for the place was inhabited even in the time of the Judges, as may be inferred from Judg. iii. 13, and still more certainly from 2 Sam. x. 5. Jericho was

assigned by Joshua (xvi. 21) to the tribe of Benjamin, but lay close upon the border of Ephraim (Jos. xvi. 7) and probably belonged after the separation to the kingdom of Israel. At present only a wretched and dirty village stands on its site, with a castle and some traces of walls, which, however, furnish no clear evidence of the remains of an old city, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 523 ff.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### FIRST APPEARANCE OF ELIJAH.

As in the reign of Ahab the worship of Baal was raised to the supremacy in the kingdom of Israel by means of Jezebel, his idolatrous wife, and a violent persecution threatened the prophets, and all the servants of God, who wished neither to identify nor exchange Jehovah and Baal; the Lord was obliged, if he wished any longer to be acknowledged and worshipped in Israel as God and king of his people, to vindicate his true Divinity, and invisible sovereignty in such a manner, that even the boldest adversaries of his majesty would be constrained to acknowledge, that not Baal, but Jehovah is God in Israel, whose arm is not too short to punish the godless despisers of his name. If ever at any time, certainly now was he bound to raise up prophets, who might hold up his law to the apostates and idolaters, and be able to command respect for their word by miraculous deeds. Thus the appearance of such men as Elijah and Elisha is antecedently warranted by the course, which the development of the theocracy had taken in the kingdom of the ten tribes, and the greatness as well as the multitude of the miracles, by which these men proved themselves to be the messengers of the Lord, is occasioned by the greatness and generality of the apostasy from the true God, the true and only King of his refractory people Israel. What was done at the first revolt of the ten tribes from Jehovah, their Divine King, at the introduction of the calf-worship by Jeroboam, on the part of the Lord to maintain the honour of his

name (xiii.), that must now be repeated in a more emphatic form, when the revolt has been carried to complete idolatry. To the rationalistic mode of viewing the biblical history, however, these miracles, because they take place in so mighty and astonishing a manner, are so offensive, that the appeal to the miraculous legends of Elijah and Elisha has become as it were a shibboleth, which neological criticism has continually in its mouth in rejecting the historical character of the Books of Kings. Besides the general grounds, however, on which rationalism opposes in general the possibility, suitableness, and necessity of the biblical miracles, and endeavours to establish their mythical character, the refutation of which neither belongs to a commentary on the Books of Kings, nor is necessary so long as the valid grounds opposed to this view by *Pareau, disputatio de mythica sacri Cod. interpretatione, Traj. ad Rhen.* 1824, are only ignored, not refuted, the only objection here urged is the unusual accumulation of the miraculous, and the surprising similarity of the legends of Elijah and Elisha.[1] With regard to the first point, namely, that in reading the history of Elijah and Elisha, to use the expression of Eichhorn (i. p. q. q. 202) we "seem to be transferred into a world that is not governed by eternal laws, but the course of which is perpetually interrupted by the intervention of the Deity," this correct remark is not in the least explained by the alternative, that the members of the prophetic order, especially Elijah and Elisha, were either jugglers and shamans, or their acts and fortunes coloured with miracle by the later legends, so that we can no longer with certainty disengage the pure historical element. The accumulation of the miraculous is explained much rather, as Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 147 f., and Hävern. ii. 1 p. 166 f. have remarked, by the pecu-

[1] Thus Eichhorn on the legends of the prophets of the kingdom of Israel, in his allg. Bibl. d. bibl. Litt. iv. 2. p. 193 ff. and by W. Meyer, on the relation of the accounts of Elisha to those of Elijah, in Ammon's and Bertholdt's Krit. Journ. iv. 3, p. 223 ff. Moreover G. L. Bauer, hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 131 ff., Bertholdt, hist. krit. Einl. iii. p. 956, Winer, R.W. *s.v.* Elias and Elisa, Rödiger, allgem. Encycl. d. Wissensch. xxxiii. p. 330 ff. and 345 f., Gramberg, die Religionsid. ii. p. 456 ff., Vatke, die Relig. d. A.T. § 24, Knobel, der Prophetism. ii. p. 73 ff., Köster, die Proph. d. A. u. N. T. p. 70 ff., and many others, have declared themselves for the mythical character of these narratives.

liar position of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel, where they had not as in the kingdom of Judah a protection weighty and venerable from its antiquity in the legally established sanctuary and the Levitical priesthood, but found themselves in a hostile position to the kings as well as the priests of the calves. In this position the Israelitish prophets required, if they were to fulfil the end of their mission, a much greater support and more manifest attestation on the part of God by miracles than the prophets in the kingdom of Judah. Here also the prophetic element was obliged, if its agency was to have effect and durability, to form itself into a fixed internal organization in the schools of the prophets, as we find them in the chief seats of idolatry, at Bethel, 2 Ki. ii. 3; Jericho, ii. 5; Gilgal, iv. 38, which were founded and conducted by the most distinguished prophets as spiritual fathers, and were able to make amends to the people for that which the pious in Judah possessed in the temple and Levitical priesthood. In Israel, therefore, the prophets at the same time occupy the place of the priests of God, offer sacrifice on altars dedicated to the Lord, hold assemblies on the Sabbaths and new moons, and teach and counsel the faithful of the people who apply to them with their petitions.[1]—But with regard to the other point especially urged by Meyer, namely, "that the great similarity and almost entire identity of the accounts of the two prophets, which are discernible in their different annunciations of the future, in the performance of beneficent miracles, in the way and manner in which the respect due to the prophets is vindicated and its violation resented in both, and lastly, even in relation to that which happened to them after the earthly activity of the former and the death of the latter, is to this extent always unusual even

[1] Hävern. i. p. q. here aptly remarks: "When the temple was wanting, the worship of images took its place, and the priesthood constituted an unlawful caste, the spreading evil could only be remedied in an extraordinary way. In opposition to the illegality represented by the kingly and priestly offices appeared the prophetic element as the representative of the law, and therefore as a properly organised fixed whole in a proper corporation of considerable extent in its permanent membership. As the only authorized representative and continuation of the law, therefore, this prophetic order was furnished with the power and majesty of the law manifesting itself in miracles; as the spirit, so the wonder-working power of Moses devolved upon Elijah and his associates.

in persons of the same station, the same relations, and the same character, and can neither be explained by an accidental identity of events and facts, nor by the supposition that Elisha in his proceedings had taken the acts of Elijah for his model, and as it were copied them, but most probably by the circumstance that the later legend copied the accounts of Elisha from those of Elijah his predecessor," the thing to be proved, namely, the mythical character of these accounts, and their later formation by the "exaggerating, embellishing legend," is assumed to be established, so that with the assumption falls also the conclusion derived from it. Besides, as will be shown in the explication of the several chapters, the similarity of the two narratives is represented as much greater than it really is, while the diversities, which the acts directed to the same object as well as the prophecies of similar content along with their general resemblance still have in the several collateral circumstances, is entirely overlooked, so that what remains of general resemblance after the deduction of these diversities is sufficiently explained, partly by the common call of the two prophets and the similar circumstances in which they acted, partly by the fact that Elisha was the scholar and follower of Elijah, who, being embued with a double inherited portion of the spirit of his spiritual father, was called only for the continuation of the work of his predecessor and master. Not as mere imitator, but as scholar of Elijah, does Elisha continue the work of his master, and performs in number indeed more miracles than the former, but in regard to the spiritual power of his agency stands considerably behind the power and energy of his master. In the person of Elijah the prophetic power reaches its culminating point. As a second Moses he administers the law and is zealous for the honour of the Lord, in order to bring back to him his contemporaries who had fallen from God, to turn the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers (comp. Mal. iii. 24 and Hengstenb. Christol. on it.) The miracles of Moses are therefore partly repeated in his life and conduct (xviii. and xix.) But at the same time as prophet he is not merely the forerunner but partly the model of the great prophet promised by Moses, who should fulfil the law and the prophets, Matt. v. 17. His non-Israelitish extraction, his sojourn at Zarephath bringing a bless-

ing to the pious heathen woman, and several other things, point to the time when the Lord also will cause the heathen to partake in the blessings of the kingdom of God; and the raising of the dead child of the widow performed by him, as well as his ascent into heaven, are types of the raising of the dead and the ascension into heaven of Christ, before whose coming the spirit of Elijah was revived in John the Baptist.

V. 1. The first appearance of Elijah is somewhat mysterious. He is not introduced in the form usual on the appearance of the other prophets in our books: "the word of the Lord came to him," but comes forward all at once and announces a penal miracle to Ahab in the name of the Lord. This might be in some measure explained by the fact that only the leading events in this proceeding are communicated; for no doubt Elijah at the same time stated to Ahab the cause of the penal judgment to be inflicted by the Lord on him and his people, if he did not also administer to him a severe rebuke,[1] as not words but only deeds were calculated to break the obdurate heart of the king. But at the same time it is in harmony with the peculiar personality of our prophet, according to which the Divine spiritual power presents itself in him as it were personified, so that his conduct is to be regarded more as the immediate result of the personality granted to him from above, than as the mediate expression of momentary inspiration, in consequence of which the other prophets appear rather the instruments of the Lord.—But a wonderful darkness hangs over his origin. This is obviously indicated by the epithet הַתִּשְׁבִּי, the Tishbite; but a תִּשְׁבִּי or תִּשְׁבָּה nowhere occurs as the name of a town or place in Palestine.[2]

[1] As for example C. a Lap. assumes: *non dubium est, Eliam zelo æstuantem prius Ahab regem monuisse de abdicando cultu Baal et colendo vero Deo; sed cum ille surdas adhiberet aures, Elias a verbis ad verbera venit ac totam terram percussit sterilitate, ut Ahab et idololatræ discerent, non Baal, ut ipsi putabant, sed Deum verum dare pluviam messem, ceteraque terræ bona, etc.*

[2] Hiller indeed in the *Onomast.* and Reland, *Pal. ill.* p. 1035, have concluded from Tob. i. 2, according to which the old Tobit was led captive out of Θίσβη in Galilee by the Assyrian king, that this town was the birth-place of Elijah: but this Θίσβη itself owes its origin to a false translation of the Hebrew מִתִּשְׁבֵי in the LXX., as the comparison of the Hebrew text edited by Münster in the 4th vol. of the London Polyglott shows. Also the Hebrew treatise of the book of Tobit

The phrase מִתֹּשָׁבֵי גִלְעָד "from the residents of Gileads," also, proves not only that he was no native Gileadite but a sojourner there for a time, but points at the same time to a foreign origin. For if Elijah had been by birth a Galilean, as so many suppose, he would have been sufficiently indicated to every Israelite by the designation from his birth-place, and the remark, that he belonged to the residents of Gilead, would have been superfluous, as no biography in the form of annals was to be given of him. But on the contrary, if he was a foreigner, *ex nulla tribu Iisrael oriundus* (Seb. Schm.) the addition of the residents of Gilead was necessary to account for his appearance. התשבי must therefore denote the origin of Elijah from an unknown place not belonging to Israel. Not very improbable is the conjecture of J. D. Mich., that he might have been an Ishmaelite, as this people bordered on Gilead, and retained the knowledge of the one God inherited from the patriarch Abraham longer than other heathens.[1] The calling of a foreigner is in keeping with his destination. As he was no Israelite by birth, he was also to have no settled place of residence in Israel. By choosing for himself a minister from the heathen and calling him into his land, the Lord designed to show Israel to his shame, that, if he fell from his vocation by persevering in apostasy, he had the power to call the heathen to be the people of his covenant and adopt them into his kingdom.[2]

published by Fagius, which is a translation from the Greek (comp. de Wette, Einl. p. 424) has מִתֹּשָׁבֵי, and neither the *Vulgate* nor the Syriac version, which, however, was made from the Greek text, knows a Thisbe.

[1] Here we might also cite the tradition in *Pseudepiph. de proph. c.* 5, *Doroth. Tyr.* and *Isidor. Hispal.*, that he sprang from Arabia, see Knobel ii. p. 74, not. 3, if it were not proved unhistorical by the addition, that he was also of the tribe of Levi and a priest. Besides, γῆ Ἀράβων or Arabia in these later writers is to be understood in general of the country east of the Jordan.

[2] The non-Israelitish origin of Elijah has also been so offensive to expositors, that Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 13, 2) invents a town Θεσβώνη in Gilead, and Clericus, who has so much penetration as to discern the true origin of the supposed town of Thisbe in Tob. i. 2, is yet more willing to assume the existence of a town or village Thisbe somewhere in the land of Israel than to admit, *tam eximium prophetam Proselytum aut ex Proselytis oriundum fuisse.* This repugnance has led the modern theologians also to give at once unconditional credit to the more than feeble authority of the book of Tobet for Thisbe.

The expression of Elijah, "As Jehovah God of Israel liveth, whom I serve, there shall not fall dew or rain these years but according to my word," in which at once the mighty spirit of this prophet appears in all its grandeur, is a special application of the warnings and threatenings of the law, Deut. xi. 16 f., Lev. xxvi. 19, Deut. xxviii. 23 f., to his own idolatrous times. On עָמַד לִפְנֵי comp. remarks p. 3. The הַשָּׁנִים הָאֵלֶּה implies no definite period. The statement of the duration of the punishment announced would have only weakened the effect of his word, as a misfortune, the end of which is known, is more easy to bear. In the כִּי אִם־לְפִי דְבָרִי lies a striking contrast between Elijah and other prophets: *nisi ego et non alius vir, etiamsi propheta sit vel prophetam mentiatur, dixero.* Seb. Schm.

Vv. 2—6. After Elijah announces the punishment to Ahab, he must hide himself at God's command, until the time of punishment has reached its end. This concealment was not so much to secure Elijah from the anger and the persecution of Ahab and Jezebel, for Elijah afterwards appears before them both without fear, but to prevent; *quominus Achabus ab eo peteret pœnae remotionem. Quia enim propheta dixerat, ad verbum suum venturam pluviam, utique ursissent eum ut juberet venire.* Seb. Schm. The manner in which Elijah announced the cessation of rain must have produced the impression in Ahab's mind, that he had brought this plague on the country by a magic power obtained from God, with which was necessarily connected the belief, that he, as soon as he only wished, was able by the same magic power, which according to Jam. v. 17 f. was his prayer, to effect its return. In order therefore to cut off the possibility of any attempt to move the prophet to this, Elijah is withdrawn from his eyes and his enquiries, as he is to hide himself at the brook Cherith in a solitary desert east of Samaria. The situation of this brook is not known. From the ambiguity of the עַל־פְּנֵי, which may mean east of Jordan, comp. Gen. xxv. 18, but also in sight of Jordan, comp. Gen. xvi. 12, xviii. 16, xix. 28, it is even questionable, whether it is to be sought on the east side of Jordan, as v. Raumer, Pal. p. 67, after Euseb. and Jerome assumes, or with Reland, Pal. p. 293 and others, on the west. Tradition, to which however no weight is to be attached,

points it out in Phasaelis on this side the Jordan, see Rel. Pal. p. q. and Ges. *thes.* ii. 719.[1] At all events it must have flowed in a waste and scarcely accessible solitude; this is to be inferred not only from the design, with which it was appointed as the residence of Elijah, but also from this, that it presented no means of support but water, on which account the Lord commanded the ravens to bring him food. This miracle of the Divine power and providence for his own, by which the confidence of the prophet must have been strengthened for the approaching conflict with the idolaters and the sufferings and privations awaiting him in his vocation, gave many of the old theologians such offence, that they changed the troublesome ravens now into Arabians, now into Orebites, (inhabitants of an imaginary city Orbo, or dwellers on the rock Oreb), now into merchants,[2] not reflecting

[1] Many old theologians consider it identical with the brook Kanah, mentioned Jos. xvi. 8, xvii. 9, forming the boundary of Ephraim and Asher, comp. Boch. *Hieroz.* ii. p. 216, but without any ground. Lastly, Robinson (Pal. ii. p. 534) is inclined to seek it in the Wady el Kelt, which falls into the Jordan beside Jericho, and about two hours to the east of it, and formed the boundary of Judah and Israel, or between the tribes of Ephraim and Benjamin (Rob. ii. 326.) In favour of this conjecture would be the wild nature of this region, if the long valley of the Jordan did not contain several desert and uninhabited districts; but against it is the close proximity of Jericho then rebuilt by Hiel, which at this time made this exact spot scarcely fit for a secure place of concealment.

[2] These wonderful hypotheses are, indeed, all conclusively refuted by Boch. *hieroz.* ii. *l.* 2, *c.* 13, p. 214, but have been since again brought forward. Thus the assumption, that עֹרְבִים is to be changed into עֲרָבִים, by an anonymous writer in Beyer's allg. Mag. f. Pred. viii. 3, p. 278, by Jahn, Einl. ii. 1 p. 261, and Meyer, Hermeneut. d. A. T. ii. p. 261. The second, that עֹרְבִים were inhabitants of the city Orbo or of the rock Oreb, after R. Judah in *Beresch. rabb.* c. 33, has been renewed by Herm. v. d. Hardt, and more recently by Dathe, after Reland (Pal. p. 913 f.) had already proved the non-existence of a town of this name. The explanation of עֹרְבִים by merchants, has met with least favour, though it rests on Ezek. xxvii. 27, but erroneously, as עָרַב, to mingle, may certainly mean, to trade with one, but עֹרֵב never signifies by itself a merchant. J. D. Mich., indeed, concedes its right to the word עֹרְבִים, but endeavours to explain the wonder naturally, as he makes the prophet dwell in the vicinity of a great raven-pool, and then, referring to Döbel's Jagdprakt. Ch. 133, assumes, that Elijah

that by such assumptions, irrespective of all other grounds, the main object of the narrative is directly frustrated. For if men provided the prophet with food for several months, his abode must soon have become known to the king, especially if, according to v. 6, they brought him food every morning and evening, when it would have been sufficient to have furnished the necessary supply at one time for several days. Men might certainly have also brought water from the neighbouring Jordan, so that it would not have been necessary to change his hiding place after the drying up of the Cherith. Whosoever acknowledges the living God, will confide in his omnipotence, that he can cause his servants to be nourished even by ravens, although, according to the fine remark of Winer (R.W. i. 375) they are otherwise the most voracious of birds.

Vv. 7—9. After some time the brook Cherith dried up, and Elijah received a command from God to betake himself to the Sidonian Zarephath, and thus to the land of the godless father of the godless Jezebel, where he commanded a widow to provide for him. The fulfilment of this command required strong faith, to which the Lord had encouraged him by his miraculous pre-

took again from these birds the wildfowl and young hares, which they brought to their nests, perhaps also caught the rats, field mice, and hares, which, in the great drought, came to drink at the brook, when perhaps the ravens had pounced upon them and picked out their eyes, or, lastly, such ravens, as well as hawks, sparrow-hawks, and falcons, may have taught him to hunt. But ingeniously as this learned man had provided in this way for the flesh, his sagacity has forgotten the bread, which Elijah, according to the text, received likewise daily from the ravens! At the present day it is sufficient to have mentioned this hypothesis, to which even the venerable J. J. Hess (Gesh. i. p. 98) gave his approval. The text knows nothing of bird-catching and nest-robbing, but acknowledges the Lord and Creator of the creatures, who *commanded* the ravens to provide his servant Elijah with bread and flesh.—The modern rationalists, seeing the absurdity of this attempt at exposition, have abandoned the investigation of the matter of fact lying at the basis of this narrative, and contented themselves with representing it as a myth embellished by tradition, and uncritically comparing it with the heathen fables, that Cyrus was suckled by a bitch, Romulus and Remus by a she-wolf, Telephus was fed by a stag, Pelias by a horse, Semiramis by a dove (comp. *Aeliani var. hist.* xii. 42, *Liv.* i. 4, *Diod. Sic.* ii. 4, *Justini hist* i. 4, *Philostr. vit. Apoll.* i. 5), and other myths and legends, see Rödiger i. p. q. p. 322, Knobel i. p. q. p. 84, Winer, and others.

servation at the brook Cherith.—מִקֵּץ יָמִים is generally explained, *post annum*, after the interval of a year, as יָמִים has undoubtedly the meaning of a complete definite period, that is, a year, in cases where the period designated by it amounts to a year, either from the context, as Lev. xxv. 29, 1 Sam. xxvii. 7, or from the nature of the thing, as Judg. xvii. 10. Neither has place here, and יָמִים denotes an indefinite longer period, in v. 15, however, a period of at least two years, comp. the remarks on xviii. 1.—צָרְפַת *Σαρεπτα* (LXX.) lay on the Mediterranean Sea between Tyre and Sidon. Only the name of this city now exists, Surafend, which a large village on the heights adjacent to the former city now bears, see Rob. Pal. iii. p. 690 ff.

Vv. 10—16. At the gate of Zarephath Elijah meets a widow engaged in picking up wood. To ascertain whether she were the one to whom the Lord directed him, he asks of her water to drink and a morsel of bread to eat, whereupon she assures him with a solemn asseveration that she has nothing baken (מָעוֹג a cake baked in the ashes, which served for bread in the East) but only a handful of meal in a barrel and a little oil in a cruse, and is gathering wood to prepare it for herself and her son, as she wished to eat this last residue and then to die. From this speech of the widow it appears, on the one hand, that the drought and famine extended also over the Phœnician coast, as is attested also by Menander of Ephesus;[1] on the other hand the widow by the appeal חַי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ proves herself to be a worshipper of the true God, who, because she at the same time recognizes the prophet as an Israelite, designates Jehovah as his God; so that we are not entitled to conclude with J. D. Mich. from the אֱלֹהֶיךָ, that she must have previously known the prophet, which is obviously contrary to the spirit of the narrative as well as the Divine intention in the guidance of Eiijah. To arrive at indubitable certainty, that this widow fears the true God, is the

[1] From the Phœnician history Josephus (*Antiq*. viii. 13, 2) communicates the notice: *ἀβροχία τε ἐπ' αυτοῦ* (sc. *Ιθοβάλου τοῦ Τυρίων βασιλέως*) *ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς ἕως τοῦ ἐχομένου ἔτους Ὑπερβερεταίου*. Hyperberetaeus corresponds to Tisri of the Hebrews, comp. Benfey and Stern on the names of the months of some ancient nations, Berl. 1836. p. 18.

provider appointed for him by the Lord, Elijah comforts her, but at the same time asks her to bake a little cake of the last remnant of her meal and oil for him first, and afterwards to make for herself and her son, with the added promise, that Jehovah the God of Israel will not let the meal in the barrel and the oil in the cruise fail, until he again sends rain on the ground. And the widow did according to the word of the prophet; she gave up the certain for the uncertain, because she trusted in the word of the Lord, and received the reward of her genuine faith, as she suffered no want of meal or oil during the whole time of the drought. This act of the believing heathen, who had in simplicity of heart received the knowledge of the true God which she had derived from Israel, must have tended to strengthen the faith of Elijah in the hour of temptation, when it was inclined to waver on account of the multitude of idolaters in Israel. If the Lord had preserved even among the heathen true confessors of his name, his work in Israel could not be altogether in vain. But the widow herself received from Elijah not merely corporeal but spiritual blessing; for he was sent to this widow, as Christ in the gospel, Luke iv. 25 f., declared to the shame of his unbelieving contemporaries, not merely that he might be safely concealed with her, although this object was thereby better attained than by a longer residence in the land of Israel, but on account of her faith, for the strengthening and promoting of which he was sent to her and not to any of the many widows in Israel, many of whom would doubtless have received the prophet, if they had through him been delivered from the pressing famine. The miraculous increase also of the meal and the oil served not merely for sustaining the prophet and the widow, but the relief of their bodily need was to become at the same time preparatory means of remedying their spiritual defects. On the form תִּתֵּן, which the Masoretes would change into תֵּת, comp. the remarks on vi. 19. And in v. 15 the Masoretic change of הוא־וָהִיא into הִיא־והוא has been rightly rejected by Maur. as arbitrary. The *masc.* חָסֵם v. 16 is explained by this, that the gender of the verb is sometimes regulated not by the *nom. regens*, but by that of the *nom. rectum*, as far as this contains the main idea, see Ewald, Gramm. § 570.

Vv. 17—24. Some time after Elijah took up his abode in the upper room of this widow's house, her son became so ill that he died. Herein she sees a punishment of God for her sins, which has been brought upon her by the presence of the man of God, and says to Elijah, "What have I to do with thee, O thou man of God? Art thou come unto me to call my sin to remembrance, and to slay my son?" V. 18. Although these words contain the superstitious idea that God only through the presence of his prophet took notice of her fault, which he would otherwise have overlooked, and was led to its punishment, yet they indicate at the same time a mind susceptible of the truth and conscious of its sins, that needed purification from error. But as the blindness of the man that was born blind in John ix., so the death of her son was not inflicted on her as the punishment of her particular sins, but was designed to be a means of revealing the work of God in her (John ix. 3), that turned to the salvation of her soul.—Elijah brings the dead child to his upper chamber, complains to the Lord of his distress, stretches himself three times upon the body, and cries to the Lord, let the soul of this child come into his inmost part again, whereupon God the Lord hearing his prayer restored the life of the child. The words: "Hast thou also brought evil upon the widow, with whom I sojourn, by slaying her son?" v. 20, are not a reproach against God, but an expression of the heartfelt sympathy which the prophet felt for the affliction of his benefactress, and of the deep grief that, springing from the most lively faith in the hour of need, pours out the whole heart to God, in order the more earnestly to implore his aid. Such words give utterance to a childlike confidence of faith, that does not cease to pray until the Lord hears the petition. Their meaning is: Thou canst not possibly, O Lord my God, according to thy mercy and truth, leave the son of this widow in death. And because such faith bears within it the certainty of being heard, the prophet immediately proceeds to the act of awakening the child again. וַיִּתְמֹדֵד he measured himself, that is, stretched himself three times upon him, in order not, as Dereser thinks, partly to learn if there was still any life in him, as Paul did, Acts xx. 10, partly to warm the body of the child and bring his juices into motion, as Elisha treated a dead child, 2 Ki. iv. 34, for the conduct of Elijah is quite differently

described, and the youth, in Acts xx., was only apparently dead, not really deceased, as the son of our widow,—but to convey the quickening power of God to the dead body, and thereby support his word and prayer. *Factum est, ut corpus prophetae esset instrumentum miraculi, quemadmodum alias in miraculo manus imposita.* Seb. Schm.[1]—V. 24. By this miracle of the raising of the dead, in which Elijah proved himself the forerunner of the raiser of all the dead, the believing heathen is greatly confirmed in her confidence, that Elijah is a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in his mouth is truth. She had, indeed, already acknowledged him as a man of God, but not so that she received as truth the word of his mouth with unhesitating faith.

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### ELIJAH'S INTERVIEW WITH AHAB AND CONTEST WITH THE PROPHETS OF BAAL.

Vv. 1, 2. In the third year of his sojourn at Zarephath, Elijah receives the Divine command, to show himself again to Ahab, as the Lord would again send rain upon the land. The term "in the third year" the Rab., C. a Lap., Münst., Cler., and others, reckon from the time of the drought; Vatabl., Seb. Schm., and most other expositors more correctly from the time of his sojourn at Zarephath, which was last mentioned. This assumption deserves the preference as the simplest and most natural, and is confirmed as the oldest by Luk. iv. 25, and Jam. v. 17, as Christ and James say, that in the time of Ahab it rained not for three years and six months. This interval is only gained by reckoning

[1] Only rationalistic misunderstanding could therefore find here an indication of the natural explanation of the miracle, namely, that the child, who, in consequence of violent convulsions, had fallen into a deep swoon (!) was recalled to life by the pressure, the animal warmth and the medicines employed, of which last the text knows nothing. Comp. Winer R.W. i. p. 376. As little is the revival effected by the application of animal magnetism, as Ennemoser, der Magnetism. p. 422, or by other medical means, as Knobel, d. Proph. i. p. 56, thinks.

the sojourn of Elijah at Cherith above one, and at Zarephath above two years.

Vv. 3—8. The verses 3—6 contain an intervening remark, by which the meeting of Elijah with Ahab is accounted for. According to time the circumstance here mentioned precedes this meeting, but connects itself logically with the last sentence of v. 2, so that וַיִּקְרָא is to be regarded as *temp. histor.* not as *plusquamp.*—To seek fodder for his horses and mules, that no part of his cattle (מִן in מֵהַבְּהֵמָה, v. 5, is partitive) might perish, Ahab, with the governor of his house (אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַבָּיִת, comp. on iv. 6), Obadiah had undertaken an excursion through the land in such a manner that they had divided the land between them for this purpose, and the one passed through this district, the other through that. V. 7 f. In this excursion Elijah meets Obadiah, a very pious worshipper of the Lord, who had taken a most active interest in the prophets of the true God that were persecuted by Jezebel (v. 14), and charges him to announce his presence to Ahab.

Vv. 9—14. Obadiah at first declines to execute this commission because he is afraid that his compliance would cost him his life, as the prophet, while he goes to announce his presence to Ahab, may be suddenly carried away by the Spirit of the Lord, so that he can no more be found. For in that case the whole anger of Ahab, who had sought after him in every kingdom and nation, and taken an oath of each that it found him not, will turn against him, and he will slay him, especially as he could enjoy no great favour with the king, because he preserved a hundred prophets of Jehovah from the murderous hands of Jezebel by concealing them, fifty in a cave, and supplying them with bread and water. —From the fear expressed by Obadiah, that the Spirit of Jehovah might carry off the prophet to an unknown place (v. 12), Seb. Schm. and others conclude, that in the previous history of Elijah, similar cases, not recorded, of sudden removal had taken place. But this apprehension of Obadiah might have been formed from the circumstance, that Elijah, after he had announced the approaching drought to Ahab, disappeared, and, notwithstanding all the searches for him instituted by the king, was nowhere to be found. And as he was not miraculously carried away at that

time (comp. לֵךְ and וַיֵּלֶךְ xvii. 3 and 5), so there is no ground for presuming cases of this kind in the interval, when he was otherwise concealed from his enemies. And the subsequent removal of Elijah to heaven (2 Ki. ii. 14 f.), and the miraculous removal of Philip from the chamberlain of Ethiopia (Acts viii. 39) do not warrant such an assumption; still less the passage Ezek. iii. 12, 14, adduced by Cler. and Schultz, because the therein-mentioned removal of Ezekiel through the air took place only in vision and not in external reality. Had Obadiah known an actual case of this kind, he would no doubt have specified it as a more striking ground of his apprehension.—Ahab had sought the prophet, in order to compel him to recall the plague that afflicted his land and people (comp. remarks on xvii. 2) everywhere, both in and beyond the land. The words: "There is no nation or kingdom, whither my lord hath not sent to seek thee" (v. 10), are a hyperbole suggested by the fear of Obadiah, and therefore not to be pressed too far.

Vv. 15—20. As hereupon Elijah gives Obadiah the solemn assurance, that he will this day show himself to Ahab, he announces his appearance to the king, who thereupon goes to meet the prophet. As soon as he sees him, he thinks to impose on him by the stern address: "Art thou he, that troubleth Israel," but the prophet with reckless freedom retorts on him this reproach, "Not I, but thou and thy family, in that ye forsake the commandments of the Lord and thou followest Baalim," have troubled Israel. On עָכַר to bring into trouble, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 1021; and on יְהוָֹה צְבָאוֹת (v. 15) comp. the fundamental investigation of F. A. Strauss, *vatic. Zeph.* p. 61 ff.—V. 19 f. To prove to the king by ocular demonstration, that the Baalim worshipped by him are nothing, and Jehovah the God of Israel the only true God, whereby at the same time the groundlessness of the king's reproach against him and the truth of his own answer would be implicitly shown, Elijah desires Ahab to assemble the people of Israel with the 450 prophets of Baal and the 400 prophets of Asherah on Carmel.[1] Now although Ahab,

[1] Vatabl., Seb. Schm., and others, limit too much the object of this request, when they find in it only the design of Elijah to prove to Ahab that he himself and not the prophet troubled Israel. To attain this object alone, it was not necessary either to assemble the people or to

in compliance with the demand of the prophet, sent round to all Israel and summoned these prophets, yet it appears that the 400 prophets of Asherah, whom Jezebel, the daughter of the Tyrian high priest of Astarte, fed from or even at her table (comp. on אֹכְלֵי שֻׁלְחָן the explanation p. 25), and had probably brought with her from Tyre, auguring nothing good, evaded the king's command, and did not appear, as in what follows, mention is only made of the 450 prophets of Baal. Carmel is a "many-topped promontory, intersected with many greater and smaller ravines," about thirty-six miles long, which, being covered in many places with thick brushwood and trees, presents a majestic appearance, and from its various summits opens up charming views of the Mediterranean Sea, and dips its foot into its waters. On the northwest extremity stands a celebrated Carmelite convent, according to v. Schubert's measurement at a height of only 582 Paris feet above the level of the sea, dedicated to the prophet Elijah, who is said to have dwelt in a grotto found under the convent, while the monks show another grotto outside the convent-walls as the former residence of Elisha (2 Ki. iv. 25 ff.) At the northern foot of Carmel appears the brook Kishon, which falls into the celebrated bay of Ptolemais or Acre, see Winer R.W. i. p. 247 f., v. Schubert, Reise iii. p. 205 ff., and Rob. Pal. iii. p. 426 f.—These localities must have added considerably to the impression of the transaction about to be performed.

Vv. 21—25. When on the day appointed the people appeared with the prophets of Baal on Carmel, Elijah directs his address to the assembled multitude, because on account of the known imbecility of Ahab he could expect to impress not so much the king as the people. "How long halt ye on both sides! If Jehovah be God, follow him:—And the people answered him not a word." They are struck with this reproach of foolish uncertainty, as they wished to serve Jehovah and Baal at the same time, but have not the resolution to decide for Jehovah

slay the discomfited idol-prophets. Not to mention that he does not attain even this object with Ahab. The prophet wished much more to bring before the eyes of the whole people a practical proof of the alone reality and Divinity of Jehovah, and of the vanity of the Baalim who were represented as gods, and after the discomfiture of the prophets of Baal by their death, to give a deadly blow to the worship of idols in Israel. For this end he undertakes to vindicate the honour of Jehovah against the idols in a solemn conflict.

alone, and are therefore silent. The people identified Jehovah therefore with Baal, and their worship of Baal was no hostile opposition to the worship of Jehovah; rather in the popular view the heterogeneous religious elements were confounded together, as Solomon before thought he could unite the service of Jehovah with the worship of idols (see the prefatory remarks on xi.) This Elijah calls a halting on two sides. עַל־שְׁתֵּי הַסְּעִפִּים properly *super duabus opinionibus divisis*, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 963. This position of a divided heart the prophet must reject, because it is consistent indeed with the nature of heathenism, but inconsistent with the worship of the true God who demands the full surrender of the whole undivided heart (Deut. vi. 4 f.) Comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 128.—Vv. 22 ff. Now as the people remain in their undecided uncertainty, Elijah proposes to let the Deity himself decide, who is God, Jehovah or Baal? The prophets of Baal shall prepare an offering for their god, and he for Jehovah. Thereby may the true God reveal himself as such, if he answers by fire from heaven kindling the offering presented to him. This mode of decision proposed in reference to Lev. ix. (comp. Hengstenb. i. p. q.) must have appeared the fairer to the people, as the prophet of Jehovah stood alone over against a whole host of 450 Baal-prophets. The latter therefore cannot draw back, without publicly resigning their authority, whether they believed that Baal would actually perform the thing required, or hoped by some chance or device to be able to escape from the snare laid for them, or even expected that the God of Elijah would no more stand the test of Divinity required of him than Baal. In order to cut off every evasion in case of the failure of their undertaking, Elijah gives them not only the precedence in this offering, but also the choice of the two oxen provided for the offering, whereby the fairness of his proposal for each party must have appeared evident, and therefore the people willingly assented.

Vv. 26—29. The prophets of Baal thus proceed to do what was required; they take the ox, which was given them, prepare the offering (וַיַּעֲשׂוּ)[1] and solemnly invoke Baal from

[1] From the agreement of the procedure of the prophets of Baal in this offering, which is more exactly stated v. 23, with that prescribed, Lev. i. 6—8, in offerings of oxen, Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 127 f.,

morning to noon, but no answer is returned. קָרָא בְּשֵׁם אֵל denotes the solemn invocation of the deity, comp. Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, etc.; properly so to call, that the soul of him who calls sinks into the object of his adoration. "And they leaped around the altar which was made." וַיְפַסְּחוּ is a contemptuous description of the solemn procession of these priests in their worship, the pantomimic dance, which they performed around the altar. Among others Herodian (*Hist.* v. 3) thus describes Heliogabalus conducting himself as high priest of the Emesene sun-god: *Ἱερουργοῦντα δὴ τοῦτον, περί τε τοῖς βωμοῖς χορεύοντα νόμῳ Βαρβάρων, ὑπό τε αὐλοῖς καὶ σύριγξι παντοδαπῶν τε ὀργάνων ἤχῳ.*—V.27. But when till mid-day no answer was given, Elijah mocking them begins to say: "Cry aloud, for he is a god; for he is meditating, or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." The manifest mockery of this speech lies especially in the prefatory כִּי־אֱלֹהִים הוּא, while the four times repeated כִּי is explained by the emphasis of the speech. Entering into the ideas of the idolatrous priests, who entertained no doubt of the divinity of Baal, Elijah enumerates the several possibilities, by which they were wont to excuse the want of any answer to their prayers. The deity may either be absorbed in thought, so that he, as is wont to be the case with men, does not hear what is spoken to him (שִׂיחַ is most simply explained by *meditatio*, although *confabulatio* the meaning proposed by others is also admissible); or gone aside (שִׂיג *secessio*) to transact some business; or on a journey (דֶּרֶךְ לוֹ); or perhaps even asleep. On this Cler. *ad h. l.* remarks: *Quanquam haec de Deo dicta longe sint absurdissima,*

erroneously concludes, that the priests of Baal observed the sacrificial order of Leviticus; for that which is common to both, namely, the cutting of the slain animals in pieces and laying the pieces on the wood, is of so general a nature, that it must have occurred in the offering of every large animal. This agreement, therefore, can afford no proof, that the worship of Baal did not stand in open opposition to that of Jehovah, though this is established on other grounds. This learned man, i. p. q., however, justly finds in the agreement of Elijah's procedure with Levit. in the performance of his offering (v. 33) a proof that the law of Moses was at that time extant in the kingdom of Israel.

*attamen idololatrae talia credere potuerunt, quod ex Homero intelligimus,* and after producing some proof passages from the Iliad concludes with the words: *Fateor haec fuisse somnia Graecorum, sed sapientiores non fuisse videntur Chananaei.*[1] Because even this misbelief was the popular belief, and as such was in a great measure shared by the priests themselves, who are not to be regarded wholly as deceivers, but were mostly self-deceived, the prophets of Baal did not feel themselves attacked by the mockery of Elijah, but actually began to cry louder (v. 28), and when even this did not avail, at length to cut themselves with swords and lances כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם after their custom. Many ancient writers (Seneca, Lucian, Statius, Apuleius, Arnobius, Lactantius, Augustinus, etc.) notice this custom, from whose statements Movers, d. Phöniz. i. p. 682 f., thus describes the processions of the strolling bands wandering about with the Syrian goddess. "A discordant howling opens the scene. Then they fly wildly through one another, with the head sunk down to the ground, but turning round in circles, so that the loose-flowing hair drags through the mire: thereupon they first bite themselves on the arms, and at last cut themselves with two-edged swords, which they are wont to carry. Then begins a new scene. One of them, who surpasses all the rest in frenzy, begins to prophesy with sighs and groans, openly accuses himself of his past sins, which he now wishes to punish by the mortifying of the flesh, takes the knotted whip, which the *Galli* are wont to bear, lashes his back, cuts himself with swords, until the blood trickles down from his mangled body." This description perfectly agrees in the main points with the practice of the prophets of Baal here. Here also the conclusion or highest degree of frenzy is the prophesying

[1] As the Greeks believed of their Zeus what Elijah says mockingly v. 27 of Baal, so Mov. d. Phöniz. i. p. 386 certainly includes too much in his words, when he thus expounds. "Cry louder, for he is a god forsooth! Perhaps he is (as *Hercules philosophus Tyrus* or the Palmyrene Aglibol) engaged in meditation, or in an occasional labour (besides the twelve), perhaps on a journey (to Lybia) or asleep (slain by Typhon ?), so that (as by Iolaus ?) he must be awaked," and then concludes, that "The Israelites knew the Tyrian god as the mythical sun-hero, and the mythical view of Heracles, as we find it in later times, was also known among the Israelites, and, as it appears, predominant."

הִתְנַבְּאוּ, v. 29, which began only when noon was past, and continued till the time of the evening sacrifice. The evening sacrifice, according to Ex. xxix. 39, was to be offered "between the two evenings," that is, at sunset, but in after times was offered at the ninth hour, that is, at three o'clock P.M., comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* xiv. 4, 3. Here the לְ in לַעֲלוֹת is not to be overlooked: עַד לַעֲלוֹת means not, "till the offering," but, "till towards the offering," that is, till towards the time of the offering for v. 36, Elijah had completed all preparations for his offering at the time of the evening sacrifice (בעלות המ׳.) Yet the evening sacrifice must at that time have been offered sometime before sunset, since otherwise there would have been no time for that which took place all on one day.

Vv. 30—35. As now up to the specified time no answer was returned on the part of Baal, Elijah proceeded to the performance of his sacrifice, by repairing in the first place the ruined altar of Jehovah (v. 30),[1] that is, he took twelve stones, "according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob," and built of them the altar (v. 31 f.) By the twelve stones he practically declares, that the separation of the people into two kingdoms, as a consequence of sin, is not recognized by the Lord, before whom on the contrary the twelve tribes should form one covenant-people and have one common altar of sacrifice (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 144.) By the words "according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob, unto whom the word of the Lord came saying (Gen. xxxii. 29, xxxv. 10), Israel shall be thy name," whether they were uttered by Elijah at the building of the altar, or be only a remark of the historian, is noted the in-

[1] Thus on Carmel is found an altar of Jehovah. When it was built and when destroyed history does not record. Very improbable is the conjecture of C. a Lap. that it was formerly built by Elijah himself and destroyed by the prophets of Baal. It either descended from the times before the building of Solomon's temple, when altars of Jehovah were built in different parts of the country and were tolerated, comp. the remarks p. 37 and *J. Capelli. observ. in Reg.* xix. 14, or, as is more probable, was built after the separation of the kingdom by pious worshippers of Jehovah belonging to the kingdom of Israel, who were not permitted to resort to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 143), and, as may be inferred from xix. 10, was destroyed in the time of Ahab.

justice, with which the ten tribes had claimed to themselves alone the name Israel, which belonged to the whole people as descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob. V. 32 ff. To prevent any one after the approaching wonder expressing any suspicion of fraud, Elijah also made a trench, holding two seahs of seed, around the altar, caused the offering arranged on the altar and the wood to be drenched with four buckets of water three times in succession, so that the water ran round the altar and then filled the trench also with water. The idolaters had dealt largely in such frauds,[1] and knew how to kindle the wood from concealed excavations under the altar, in order to make the befooled people believe that the deity miraculously kindled the sacrifice. Now here, although this was rendered impossible by the many eyes of the onlookers, yet the prophets of Baal might have been so shameless as to impute such a fraud to the prophet of Jehovah, had not Elijah by this precaution prevented the possibility of such a suspicion. כְּבֵית סָאתַיִם זֶרַע "as the space of two seahs seed." On בֵּית comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 192, 7. As סְאָה, *σάτον*, is only the third part of an ephah, and according to Bertheau's reckoning (Gesch. d. Isr. p. 73) = 661.92 Par. cubic inches or 246600 Par. grains of water; Vatablus' explanation of these words, *tantae capacitatis quantae est saccus capax duorum satorum*, cannot be correct, but the sense can only be, "as the space, on which two seahs of seed may be sown." Should this space appear too great, it is to be considered on the one hand, that the trench was formed round the four sides of the altar, and thus being of a suitable breadth and depth, included a considerable surface; on the other hand, that the seed is not particularized, but the space, which a certain quantity of seed takes, is very different according to the size of the grains. At all events the trench must be supposed tolerably broad and deep, because only

[1] So says Joh. Chrysostom. in the *Oratio in Petrum Apost. et Eliam proph. t. i. p.* 765 *(ed. Fronto Duc.)*, the genuineness of which is indeed doubted but has not yet been disproved: Ἠλίας καὶ ἐν τούτῳ σοφίζεται. διὰ τὶ; ἀλλ' ὃ μέλλω λέγειν θεατὴς αὐτὸς γέγονα· ἐν τοῖς βωμοῖς τῶν εἰδώλων ὀπαὶ εἰσι κάτωθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ἔστι τις λάκκος κάτωθεν ἀφανὴς, καὶ κατέρχονται οἱ τῆς πλάνης ἐργάται ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ, καὶ οὕτω ταῖς ὀπαῖς ἐκείναις κάτωθεν τό πῦρ ἄνωθεν ἐκφυσῶσιν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν, ὡς πολλοὺς ἀπατᾶσθαι, καὶ νομίζειν οὐράνιον εἶναι τὸ πῦρ.

in this way could the object, for which it was made, be certainly attained. Besides the text does not state, as many interpreters think, that it was filled by the threefold emptying of the four vessels of water on the offering and the wood, but Elijah caused it to be filled besides (v. 35.)

Vv. 36—40. On completing all the preparations for the sacrifice, Elijah comes forward and prays, "Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, let it be known this day, that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word. Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou, Jehovah, art God." Herein is expressed the object of all the miracles of Elijah, and the other prophets. Israel is by them to recognise Jehovah as his God, and the prophets as his servants, who do all that they do in his name. Elijah intentionally uses the names Israel (v. 36) instead of Jacob, comp. remarks on v. 31. The words v. 37, וְאַתָּה הֲסִבֹּתָ וגו' are ambiguous. Seb. Schm. explains, that thou it is and not Baal, *qui animos eorum ad se traxerit*, and refers to the fact that the priests of Baal deceived the people with lying wonders by the permission of God. But as the idea of a passive Divine permission is foreign to the Old Testament, Elijah would thereby cast the guilt of the people's apostasy on God, and excuse the idolatry of the people. This he cannot possibly do. The sense can only be, that thou hast turned their heart backwards, that is, away from the idols, back to thyself. So R. Saadias in Kimchi and many others. In this view the *praet.* הסבת might seem strange, which is therefore understood imperatively by Cler., de Wette, and others. Contrary to grammar. The *praet.* only stands in the sense of the imperative, when it is connected by וְ *relat.* with a preceding imperative, comp. Ew. Gram. § 613. Here on the contrary וְאַתָּה corresponds to the preceding כִּי אַתָּה and the *praet.* stands before the certainly coming, which is in the Spirit represented as already come (Ew. i. p. q.) v. 38 f. Scarcely has Elijah prayed for a hearing, when the fire of Jehovah falls and consumes the offering. אֵשׁ־יְהוָֹה denotes not the lightning, for an ordinary flesh could have produced no such effect, but a fire miraculously proceeding from Jehovah, Lev. ix. 24. The miraculous origin of this fire

appears in the most conspicuous manner from its wonderful effect. It not only consumed the burnt-offering with the pile of wood laid under it, but even burned the stones and the earth, that is, *in calcem redegit* (Cler.); even the water in the trench the flame licked up. This miracle, by which, as formerly under Moses, Lev. ix. 24, the worship of Jehovah was again divinely sanctioned in opposition to the Baal-worship that had become prevalent,[1] and Elijah accredited in the clearest manner as the prophet of the Lord in contrast with the prophets of idols, made such an impression on the surrounding people, that they fell on their faces, as in Lev. ix. 24, and adoring confessed, Jehovah is God! Jehovah is God! v. 40. But Elijah, availing himself of this zeal for the Lord, immediately commands the people to seize the prophets of Baal, bring them down to the brook Kishon, and there slay them (יִשְׁחָטֵם.) This proceeding of our prophet, so offensive to the tender-hearted rationalist,[2] has been already sufficiently vindicated by the older theologians. Elijah acted right, not because he practised the merited *jus talionis* on the priests, inasmuch as "these had persecuted the servants of the true God, and at their instigation queen Jezebel has caused them to be put to death by hundreds on account of religion" (Mich., Deres.), but because of the Divine right of the theocracy, which prohibited idolatry on pain of death, Deut. xvii. 2—4; xiii. 13 ff.[3]

[1] This miracle is completely justified by this object, which has been already pointed out by Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 128. Whosoever thinks himself able to explain as myths these miraculous facts, that are historically attested, and, under the periods of time generally admitted to be historical, rendered necessary to the development of the theocracy, by comparing them with the altogether heterogeneous fancies collected together by Winer in the R. W. i. p. 376, of a Homer (Il. ii. 305, Od. ii. 143) and a Virgil (Eclog. viii. 105 f.), and the quite indefinite statement, *exstat Annalium memoria, sacris quibusdam et precationibus vel cogi fulmina vel impetrari (Plin hist. nat.* ii. 54), thereby proves only his own incompetence to judge of the facts of a Divine revelation.

[2] So says, for example, Eichhorn, i. p. q. p. 235: "Would a really good prophet have been guilty of such harshness and cruelty?" and concludes from this subjective feeling, that the fact is disfigured and exaggerated by the legend.

[3] That this law was not too severe, Mich. (Mos. R. V. § 246) has proved in his own way chiefly from the moral evil and corruption of idolatry. But we need no such grounds. Idolatry and seduction to the service of idols required to be punished with extermination as a

Vv. 41—44. After the completion of the righteous judgment on the ungodly leaders of the people, Elias invites the king, who, during the whole proceeding from morning till evening, had eaten nothing in painful expectation of the issue, to go up on the mountain and eat and drink, for already he hears the rushing of a great rain (קוֹל הֲמוֹן הַגָּשֶׁם).—קוֹל wants the *verbum*, as Is. xiii. 4, lii. 8, lxvi. 6; Jer. l. 28; Job xxxix. 24.—As the cause of the curse of drought pressing on the land was removed, the curse must at the same time cease, and give way to the Divine blessing.—The people, of whom nothing more is mentioned, probably now dispersed to refresh themselves after the example of the king with food and drink. But Elijah, far from celebrating the victory gained by grateful rest, and refreshing his body with food and drink, ascends (v. 42) to the top of Carmel to pray, that the Lord, fulfilling his promise (v. i.), would complete his work by the sending of rain, and continues in prayer until the visible beginning of the fulfilment of his prayer is announced by his servant, who, after seven times looking out on the sea, at length sees a small cloud like a man's hand arise out of the sea. —The singular position of Elijah in prayer, bowing down to

practical denial of the Lord as the only true God, if the object of the institutions of a Divine revelation was to be attained. The question, therefore, as to the legitimacy of putting to death the priests of Baal, excited so little scruple in the older theologians, that they only discussed it in order, on the one hand, to controvert the conclusion drawn from the conduct of Elijah by many, for example by P. Bayle, *diction. hist. et crit. s. v. Elie*, that thereby the bloody persecution of heretics is authorized, on the other hand to remove the objection, that Elijah here outstepped the bounds of his vocation and intruded into the office of the secular authorities, to whom alone the sword was given by God; see *Budd. hist. eccl.* ii. p. 314, Lilienthal. d. gute Sache vii. § 23 ff. But the objection and the conclusion are both obviated by the consideration, that Elijah as prophet, acting by the immediate command of God, executed that which the king, forgetting his duty as theocratic regent, neglected to do; so that there is no need of assuming what is incompatible with the known character of Ahab, that the king, either by his silence, or even by express command, concurred in the execution of the sentence of death (Polus, Dereser, and others.) Besides, that conclusion overlooks the difference between heathen idolaters and Christian heretics, and confounds the New Testament evangelical position with the Old Testament legal point of view for which Christ rebuked his disciples, Luke ix. 55 f.

the earth (יִּגְהַר comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 270) and placing his face between his knees (v. 42), Shaw and Chardin have found also among the Dervishes, see Harmar's Beobacht. v. Faber iii. p. 373 f.

Vv. 42—46. As soon as the little cloud arose from the sea on the edge of the horizon, Elijah directs Ahab by his servant to prepare for his journey lest the heavy rain should afterwards detain him. And before one was aware, the heaven was black with rain and wind, and there was a violent shower.—The phrase עַד־כֹּה וְעַד־כֹּה "till hither and thither" has received the best explanation from Schäfer in Maur. *a. h. l.*, who derives it from the movement of the hand, till one moves his hand hither and thither. For the shortest space was certainly denoted by it, which does not clearly appear in the explanation given by Ges. *thes.* ii. 651, *till then and then.*—V. 45 f. When Ahab set out for Jezreel, the hand of the Lord was on Elijah, so that he girded up his loins, and ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel, not so much to bring the king in safety to his residence (Seb. Schm.) as to give him a proof of his humility, and thereby strengthen the impression made on his heart, and still more to fortify him against the strong temptations of his wife, who turned his weakness into ungodliness. For this conduct, by which Elijah, whom heretofore Ahab knew only as a sternly commanding and powerful prophet, proved himself at the same time a true subject and servant, was quite adapted to affect the heart of the king and awaken the conviction that the prophet was angry not from subjective aversion towards his person, but only in the service of the Lord on account of his idolatry, that he intended to effect, not his overthrow, but his conversion and salvation.—In this, however, Elijah performed more than natural powers can do. For after the great exertions of a whole day, without having previously strengthened himself by nourishment and rest, to keep pace with the king's chariot, this he could only perform in consequence of bring supernaturally strengthened by the hand of the Lord. The phrase יַד יְהוָֹה הָיְתָה אֶל־פְּל׳ is akin to the phrase denoting the entrance of the prophetic inspiration יַד י״ הָ׳ עַל־פְּל׳, 2 Ki. iii. 15; Ezek. i. 3, iii. 15, etc. אֶל, however, does not stand for עַל, but denotes the direction; the power of

the Lord came to Elijah, so that, furnished with supernatural strength, he accomplished that which exceeds the natural powers; whereas יד י׳ ה על־פל׳ expresses the state of higher ecstacy, in which the human spirit is seized by the Divine and raised above itself to behold things which lie beyond the bounds of the natural perceptions of the mind.—Jezreel, where Ahab had his palace (xxi. 1), and probably resided in summer, lay at least five geographical miles distant from the midst of Carmel in the fair and fertile Esdraelon (called also Jezreel after this city) on a hill, which commanded a noble prospect of the different parts of the country, comp. remarks on v. 15, and Rob. Pal. iii. p. 391 ff., where the identity of the site of the old Jezreel with the modern Zerin, consisting of scarcely twenty houses, is proved.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### ELIJAH'S FLIGHT FROM JEZEBEL AND JOURNEY TO HOREB.

The same prophet, whom we beheld in the preceding chapter at the very height of his divinely bestowed power, here comes before us in the depth of spiritual weakness. All the power of his godlike courage and zeal has vanished; he is afraid of sinking. This wonderful change of his nature is explained by the difficult internal conflict which the Lord, who had hitherto so highly exalted him, allows to befal him, that in his weakness he should not be too much uplifted or glory in his great deeds, but, mindful of his impotence, should always humbly give God alone the honour, who had wrought so great things by him, 2 Cor. xii. 8—9.

Vv. 1—3. When Ahab on his arrival at Jezreel relates to his godless queen what Elijah had done, and how he had slain all the prophets of Baal, she flies into an ungovernable passion, and endeavours, at least by threatenings, to take vengeance on the prophet. She apprises him by a messenger of her oath by the gods, that she will, by to-morrow about this time, make his life

as the life of one of the prophets of Baal, that is, she will put him to death. Here the old interpreters have observed how plainly the *impotentia muliebris iracundiae* manifests itself in this, that she announces to Elijah her resolution to put him to death, which, if it was to be actually executed, must have been kept secret till after its execution, *ne interea aufugeret propheta aut populus ad eum defendendum tumultuaretur*. Cler. If, therefore, the act of Jezebel was not the fruit of inconsiderate blind vindictiveness, but the result of rational reflection, she might wish, by her threat, to effect only the banishment of the disagreeable and dangerous man, because she felt herself unable to put him to death, partly on account of the people who were enthusiastic for him, partly also perhaps on account of the king himself, upon whom the recent occurrence might not have been without some salutary effect.[1] V. 3. But this threat made such an impression on Elijah, that he left the country and withdrew, first to Beersheba at the farthest extremity of the kingdom of Judah.—Instead of וַיַּרְא "and he saw," namely, how things stood, there is no need of the easier conjectural reading וַיִּרָא *et timuit se*, which after the *Vulg.* several expositors have preferred. וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־נַפְשׁוֹ "he went for his life," that is, to save his life. Beersheba, a place already well-known from the history of the patriarchs (Gen. xxi. 14, 28 ff., xxii. 19, xxvi. 33, xxviii. 10, xlvi. 1), in the south border of Canaan, thirty-one Roman or six geographical miles south of Hebron, on the border between the habitable land and the wilderness, still exists in some ruins of old foundations of buildings and two well preserved wells lined with stone, under the old name Bir es Seba, which Rob. (Pal. i. p. 337 ff.) visited and described.[2]

[1] On the form of oath with כִּי following, comp. above, p. 29.

[2] As Beersheba was assigned to the tribe of Simeon (Jos. xix. 2), we have here another proof that this tribe adhered to the kingdom of Judah. For that Beersheba actually belonged to this kingdom, appears not only from the words אֲשֶׁר לִיהוּדָה (v. 3) but also from 2 Ki. xxiii. 8, 2 Chr. xix. 4. Under Uzziah indeed it was a celebrated place of pilgrimage for the subjects of the kingdom of the ten tribes, Am. v. 5, viii. 14, but to infer from this that it then belonged to this kingdom would not only be *incerta saltem conjectura* (*Fr. Bleek, de libri Genes. orig. etc.* in Bonner Progr. v. J. 1836, p. 24), but is also

Vv. 4—7. Yet even in Beersheba, where notwithstanding the friendly relations of the two kingdoms he might be pretty safe from the machinations of Jezebel, Elijah does not remain, but, leaving his servant behind, betakes himself alone into the wilderness, probably as it were with the view of making a pilgrimage to the mount of God, Horeb, that there on the very scene of the grandest events of the foretime he might strengthen his faith by the realization of the wonderful deeds of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But after he had made a day's journey into the dry waste, the spiritual drought of temptation attains to such a height, that he sits down in pure weakness of faith under a broom, and desiring to die exclaims: רַב עַתָּה וגו׳, "enough now; take away, O Lord, my soul; for I am not better than my fathers," that is, I have endured calamities enough here below and am now wearied of life, take therefore my soul to thee, Lord, for I deserve no longer life than my fathers; let me now therefore die. In explanation of this speech there is no need of the improbable assumption of Kimchi, R. Levi, Seb. Schm., and others, that Elijah had already had a revelation of his future removal to heaven. This much only appears from the last words, that he was already of advanced age. V. 5. In this state of mind Elijah lies down and sleeps under a broom *ex lassitudine itineris et mœrore animi.* C. a Lap.—רֹתֶם, v. 4 *gen. fœm.*,[1] v. 5 *gen. masc.*, is not the juniper (Luth.) but the broom (*Genista Raetem*, رَتَم in Forskål, *Flor. aeg. arab.* p. 214), one of the most

decidedly contradicted by the passages cited and even opposed by the phrase of Amos v. 5 תַּעֲבֹרוּ "go ye not over to Beersheba," comp. Hitzig on the passage. But Beersheba was certainly not at that time "a chief seat of idolatry" (Win. R.W. i. p. 172); for under the reign of Uzziah proper idolatry did not prevail in Judah, but only worship on the high places (2 Ki. xv. 4), which had probably its chief seat at this border of the kingdom, because Isaac had there built an altar, on which he and his son Jacob had offered, Gen. xxvi. 24 f., xlvi. 1 ff.—But Elijah resorted to this place not on account of the holy reminiscences of the patriarchal times connected with it, but because it lay on his way from Judah through the wilderness to Horeb.

[1] Hitzig (Begr. d. Krit. p. 124) would derive the fem. אַחַת from an error of transcription, produced by the preceding תַּחַת. This is quite improbable, as in v. 5 the same cause appears and has produced no error.

common shrubs in the water-beds and wadys of the Arabian desert, with small whitish blossoms, by which the Arabs gladly pitch their tents, in order to be sheltered from the wind by night and from the sun by day, Rob. Pal. i. 137, 136; Ges. *thes.* iii. 1316.—The Lord comes with his strength to the aid of the desponding prophet; an angel[1] awakens him from sleep and invites him to eat,—behold, he sees at his head a meal, common indeed but nourishing, an ash cake beside a cruse of water. עֻגַת רְצָפִים a cake baked on hot stones among ashes and coals laid on it, a favourite and very palatable article of food among the Israelites (Gen. xviii. 6, xix. 3) as well as among the Bedouins of the present day; comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1307 f. and Win. R.W. i. p. 108. —After the prophet had eaten of this miraculously provided fare, he lies down to sleep again, and is a second time awakened by the angel and invited to eat with the addition (v. 7): כִּי רַב מִמְּךָ הד׳, "for the way is too far for thee." The מִן in מִמְּךָ is comparative: *iter est majus, quam pro viribus tuis, q. d. vires tuæ præsentes non possent sufficere itineri, quod restat a te conficiendum.* Vatabl.

Vv. 8—10. When he had been refreshed corporeally by food and drink, and spiritually indeed also by the presence of the angel, he went in the strength of that food forty days and forty nights to Horeb, the mount of God (v. 8.) The meaning of these words is manifestly, that Elijah, through the miraculous power of the food received through the angel, travelled the whole way without obtaining any thing farther than what the wilderness might perhaps afford. Mount Horeb, called with reference to the appearance of the Lord there to Moses, Ex. iii. 1 ff., and the solemn manifestation of God on one of its summits for the giving of the law, Ex. xix. ff., the Mount of God, is distant from Beersheba 180 or at most 200 miles, so that Elijah did not require forty days for this journey, if God's design in so guiding him had been merely to bring him thither. But Elijah was to wander forty days, as formerly Moses with the whole people forty years, in the wilderness, and during this time also to par-

[1] Not "an unknown individual, whom probably his secret friends had sent," into which G. L. Bauer, hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 162 has metamorphosed the angel of God.

take of no other food than that miraculously appointed for him by God, that he might learn that the Lord is always the same, who had nourished by manna from heaven his whole people forty years in the wilderness, comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 128 f. And as the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness was to Moses a period of probation in faith, of exercise in humility, and meekness (Num. xii. 3); so also was the faith of Elijah to be proved and purified from all carnal zeal for the further right discharge of his office.[1] To this object of the guidance of our prophet points most clearly the parallel coming out still more distinctly from v. 9, with the guidance of Moses, Ex. xxxiii. f. V. 9. Arrived at Horeb, Elijah goes into the (known) cave (אֶל־הַמְּעָרָה), and passes the night there. There, probably in the night, the word of the Lord comes to him, "what doest thou here, Elijah?"—The opinion assumed as certain by Jarchi, C. a Lap. and most interpreters, even by Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 129, that the cave in which Elijah passed the night was the same in which Moses saw the Lord, derives no confirmation from Ex. xxxiii. 22, as nothing is there said of the sojourn of Moses in a cave, but the Lord only says to him: "when my glory passeth by I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand, till I have passed by." And even if Moses had actually sojourned in a cave during his long delay on Sinai, yet the identity of this cave with that occupied by Elijah cannot be proved with certainty either from the definite article or from the imitative character of our adventure. For the definite article is also used when a single object is presumed to be distinguished by the circumstances (Ew. Gr. § 533.) Thus it is said, Gen. xix. 30, Lot dwelt in the cave (בַּמְּעָרָה), although Mount Seir has more than one cave, and that inhabited by Lot is nowhere previously mentioned. The imitative character also requires no perfect agreement in every even subordinate particular, and is not to be extended farther than lies in the text, which here (comp. אל המערה, v. 8, and נקרת הצור in Ex.), points to a difference

[1] Quite mistaking this object as well as running counter to the clear words of the text (v. 8) Cler. *ad h. l.* would refer the forty days to the journey to and from, including the sojourn at, Horeb.

rather than a likeness.[1]—The question: מַה־לְּךָ פֹה אֵלִיָּהוּ, involves no reproach, *quasi Deus diceret, nihil esse Eliae negotii in solitudine, sed potius in locis habitatis, ut illic homines ad veri Dei cultum adduceret (Cler.)*, but only gives occasion to the prophet to express the thoughts and feelings of his soul, on which the following revelation of the Lord is designed to operate. In the answer of Elijah, v. 10, "I have been zealous for the Lord," etc. is expressed not only a very gloomy view of things, but also a carnal zeal that would immediately call down the vengeance of the Almighty on all idolaters. His complaint contains on the one hand the concealed reproach against God, that he had so long quietly borne the conduct of the ungodly, and allowed the matter to come to the greatest extremity, so that he, his prophet, was alone left of all the true worshippers of God; on the other hand, the indirect demand on God, that he would at length interfere with his penal judgments. Because he had not seen the expected salutary fruits of his zeal for the Lord, he believed that all was lost, and in his present darkness of mind overlooked what he had seen shortly before with his own eyes, that even in the service of the king, a pious and sincere worshipper of Jehovah,

[1] The identity of the cave occupied by Elijah with the special place of the giving of the law on Sinai cannot be proved, as the assumption demonstrated by Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 396 ff., and Rob. Pal. i. p. 197 ff., that Horeb is the general name of the whole range, while Sinai denotes the particular top, on which the law was delivered, notwithstanding the objections raised by Rödiger in the Hall. A.L.Z. 1842 No. 30, still holds its ground, and in our books (viii. 9 and here) the name Horeb is obviously used in the same sense as in Deut., that is, it denotes the whole range. But the denominations of the several parts of this range now usual, namely, the designation of Jebel Musa as Sinai and of the northern part of the same ridge as Horeb, after the long vacillation in the use of these names, have only since the seventeenth or eighteenth century become gradually fixed, comp. Rob. i. p. q. p. 427 f.—The Siniatic monks, indeed, show in the chapel they have on Jebel Musa dedicated to Elijah, "nigh the altar a niche, large enough for a man, which they say is the cave, where the prophet dwelt on Horeb" (Rob. i. p. 170); but how very uncertain these traditions and legends of the monks concerning all the localities of the sacred history, has been not only repeatedly declared by Rob. in his work, and most distinctly in v. ii. p. 1 ff., but also conclusively demonstrated in the several cases.

Obadiah lived, that he concealed a hundred prophets from the vengeance of Jezebel, that the whole people assembled on Carmel had given glory to the Lord, and at his command seized and slain the prophets of Baal, and that therefore all true worshippers of the Lord could not have disappeared out of Israel.—The phrase קַנֹּא קִנֵּאתִי לַיהוָה, as well as the thing signified by it, is explained by Num. xxv. 11—13. For when the Lord inflicted a severe punishment on the people, who had grievously sinned by committing whoredom with the daughters of Moab, and joining themselves to Baal-Peor, Zimri, the prince of a family of the Simeonites, caught in the very act of adultery with Cozbi the daughter of a Midianitish prince, was thrust through by Phinehas, whereby the penal sentence was averted from Israel, while the perpetual possession of the high priesthood was assigned to Phinehas for himself and his posterity on account of this "zeal for his God" (קנא לאלהיו.) In like manner Moses had been zealous for the Lord, Ex. xxxii. 15 ff., although קנא does not occur here and in imitation of both Elijah in xviii. 40 ff.— "Thine altars have they thrown down." Here we are to understand the altars, which pious followers of Jehovah had erected in various parts of the kingdom, the building of which was forbidden indeed in the law, but was justified by the necessities of the Lord in the kingdom of the ten tribes, comp. note on xviii. 30.

Vv. 11—18. To the complaint of the prophet the Lord answers first by the manifestation of his nature in deeds, vv. 11—14, and then by the declaration of his will in words, vv. 15—18, and reveals in his twofold manner to Elijah his name, which he expressed to Moses, when he caused his glory to pass before him: "Jehovah, Jehovah God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, who keeps mercy for thousands, forgives iniquity and transgression and sin, but by no means leaves unpunished, visits the guilt of the fathers on the children and children's children unto the third and fourth generation," Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7. The "still soft whisper," (קוֹל דְּמָמָה דַקָּה literally, sound of a soft blowing) calls to him, "God, merciful and gracious," etc.; the words, "Go, return on thy way to the wilderness of Damascus . . . . . him shall

Elisha slay," vv. 15—17, corresponds to the sentence, "he by no means leaves unpunished," etc.—So far the substance of this glorious revelation of God, which is repeated to Elisha as a second Moses. So far have we like facts only in a different form.[1] The likeness of the substance presupposes likeness of the object, with which the Lord miraculously displayed his glory to both.—Moses was so provoked with the worship of the golden calf by the people during his long absence on Mount Sinai, that he burned with vehement anger at the sight of the idolatrous scene on his descent from the mount, and not only in his irritation broke the tables of the law, because the people had broken the covenant, but also issued the command, that every man, who is for the Lord, should come to his side and slay with his sword his idolatrous brother, friend or neighbour; in consequence of which command the Levites slew of the people about 3000 men, Ex. xxxii. 15 ff. But on the following morning, having returned to the Lord on the mount to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, he again goes so far in the zeal of his intercession for his people as to say to the Lord: "And now forgive their sin! If not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written," whereupon the Lord answers, "Whosoever hath sinned against me him will I blot out of my book" (v. 33 f.), and then threatens the apostate people with the punishment, that he will not go in the midst of them into the promised land, Ex. xxxiii. V. 12 ff. Then Moses desires, on the ground of the assurance given to him, that he had found grace in the eyes of the Lord, for the confirmation of his wavering faith in the Divine promise, that he will actually lead his people into Canaan, to behold the glory of the Lord, and the Lord promises him, "I will make all my goodness (כָּל-טוּבִי) pass before thee, and proclaim the name of the Lord before thee," v. 19, and immediately performs this promise to him, Ex. xxxiv. 5 ff.—In like manner had Elijah, in the great zeal of his anger on account of apostasy, slain the authors of idolatry, the prophets of Baal, and in burning eagerness for the conversion of the weak king and the salvation of his

[1] "In the beautiful vision, which was presented to the second Moses, Elijah, on the same mount of God, Horeb, and perhaps in the same cave, the resemblance to the former history cannot be mistaken." Herder, on the spirit of Hebrew poetry (1787), ii. p. 51.

people, had followed Ahab to Jezreel under the influence of Divine power, but there he had to learn from the menace of the idolatrous Jezebel, that his labour was to all appearance fruitless. Thereupon his soul desponds; he flees, more from dejection of spirit on account of the apparent failure of his work than from fear of the foolish menace, out of the idolatrous land into the wilderness, and here, when the temptation rose by means of bodily privation to a spiritual assault, wishes for the release of his soul by death; but by the appearance of the angel, who refreshes him with food and drink, so that he is able to walk forty days without fail, he is directed to the ancient God of his fathers, whose grace and mercy have no end, although thereby he is not yet raised from his despondency, so that he arrives at Mount Horeb not in a much better state of mind. Here now the Lord appears to him, as formerly to his servant Moses, and reveals to him, as to the former, his glorious essence as love, in which grace and mercy are united, in order thereby in like manner to strengthen and provide him with the knowledge and power, love and patience, requisite for the farther discharge according to the will of God, of the difficult and troublesome task laid upon him.—But the variety in the form of this manifestation, while the substance and the main object are alike, together with the other material differences, is explained, partly by the variety of the circumstances in which the Lord manifested his glory to his servants, partly by the different state of mind on which the manifestation had to operate. In Moses it was burning love for the welfare of his people, which moved him to the prayer, that the Lord would show him his glory, and to confirm him in his call, his petition was granted as far as man can behold the glory of God. Concealed in the clift of the rock and screened by the hand of God, he sees the Lord pass by him, and hears him express in words his inmost nature. Elijah, on the contrary, from a zeal not quite free from human passion, was astray as to the proceedings of the omnipotence and righteousness of the Lord, and had to learn that this zeal was inconsistent with the love and grace of God.[1] The Lord therefore causes

[1] "The vision was to show to the fiery zeal of the prophet, that would amend everything by the storm, the mild process of God, and proclaim his long-suffering tender nature, as formerly the voice did to

his glory to pass before him, first in natural phenomena, which express his power on the earth more strongly than words. Διὰ δὲ τούτων ἔδειξεν, ὅτι μακροθυμία καὶ φιλανθρωπία μόνη φίλη Θεῷ. Theodoret. After he commanded him to go forth from the cave and stand upon the mount before him (v. 11), behold there comes a great and strong wind rending the mountains and breaking in pieces the rocks, and after the wind an earthquake, and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord is not in the storm, not in the earthquake, not in the fire, to show, that his sway in the theocracy is not implacable annihilating rigour and all-consuming jealousy. Storm, earthquake, and fire, are symbols of the Divine punishments exterminating the ungodly, Ps. xviii. 8 ff.; Is. xiii. 13; xxix. 6; xxx. 30; Sir. 39, 28 f. etc. Not in these Jehovah appears, but in קֹול דְּמָמָה דַקָּה, in the sound of a gentle blowing or soft murmur (comp. on דְּמָמָה Ps. cvii. 29), the sign of the nearness of God (Job iv. 16), which is the love that endures the sinner with sparing mildness, with patience and long-suffering, and delays the punishment as long as mercy is possible.[1] v. 13. When Elijah hears the soft whisper, having

Moses: hence the scene was so beautifully changed." Herder i. p. q. p. 52.

[1] On this Ephraim Syr., v. 12, rightly remarks, ܦܘܬܟܡܐ ܗܢܐ ܟܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܚܡܝܢܘ ܕܐܠܝܐ ܕܩܫܝܢܐ ܗܘ *hoc symbolo Deus Eliae immoderatum zelum perstringit*, but he errs, as soon as he finds the proper and historical import of this symbol in this, namely, to indicate to Elijah ܫܠܝܐ ܘܫܠܡܐ ܕܗܘܐ ܠܗ ܩܪܝܒܐ ܒܝܫ ܡܘܬܐ ܕܐܚܒ ܘܕܐܝܙܒܠ ܕܪܕܘܦܝ ܠܗ "the rest and peace, which he will soon attain (after the present storm of persecution) through the death of his persecutors, Ahab and Jezebel. The object of this theophany is moreover similarly conceived by Brentius, Seb. Schm., and others. After Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* iv. 27, many have found the difference of the old and New Testament therein represented. Even Grotius calls it *evangelii figuratio, quod non venit cum vento, terrae motu et fulminibus ut lex*, *Ex.* xix. 16 ff. The rationalists naturally see herein only a mythus; Eichhorn i. p. q. p. 238 explains the whole history of the forty days' wandering of Elijah in the wilderness, his being fed by the angel, and the manifestation of God to him on Horeb, as a dream arising in a natural (?) way." *Habeant sibi!* The object of this theophany has been on the whole rightly explained by R. Levi ben Gerson in the *Annotatt.* of Joh. Meyer to the Seder Olam p. 852.

wrapped his face in his mantle (אַדֶּרֶת see on 2 Ki. 8), because sinful man cannot bear the sight of the holy God, comp. Ex. iii. 6, he goes out, stands at the entrance of the cave, and hears a second time the question, what doest thou here, Elijah? to which he (v. 14) returns the same answer as before in v. 10. On this the Lord reveals to him, after he has shown him his grace, long-suffering, and tender mercy to the sinner, that he "by no means leaves unpunished," since he (v. 15—17) commissions him to anoint Hazael to be king over Syria, Jehu to be king over Israel, and Elisha, the son of Shaphat, of Abel-meholah (see on iv. 12) to be prophet in his stead, with the added remark, which must have satisfied his zeal, that was now certainly too passionately expressed, but was praiseworthy on account of the motive that prompted it, and encouraged the prophet in the continuance of his office: "And it shall come to pass, that him that escapeth the sword of Hazael, will Jehu slay, and him that escapeth the sword of Jehu will Elisha slay." But in order that he may learn to his shame, that to his eye, disturbed by dejection, the cause of the Lord in Israel appeared much more desperate than it stood before the eyes of God who knoweth his own by number and name, the Lord adds, "I have left in Israel 7000, all the knees that have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him" (v. 18).—The words v. 15, "Go return on thy way to the wilderness of Damascus, and come then and anoint," etc. are not to be so understood as if Elijah had immediately to proceed to Damascus, and there anoint Hazael, but Elijah is to withdraw for some time into the wilderness of Damascus, where, secure from the revenge of Jezebel, and yet not far from the scene of his activity in Israel, he might execute his three commissions at the time to be more exactly determined by the Spirit. He immediately accomplishes only the calling of Elisha to be his successor (v. 19 ff.), who then afterwards, only after the ascension of Elijah, executes the other two,[1] see 2 Ki.

[1] It is equally incorrect, when J. D. Mich. thinks that for this reason he must assume, that Elijah was still living, when Elisha at his command executed these commissions, and therefore was not carried alive to heaven, as when Köster, die Proph. p. 76, draws from it the conclusion, that the concentrating legend wishes thereby to strengthen the miraculous light, which surrounded Elijah by committing to him what was only carried into effect by his successor.

viii. 7—13, ix. 1—10.—The *Vulg.*, Luth., de Wette render מִדְבָּרָה דַמָּשֶׂק falsely: *per desertum in Damascum;* the words are connected: *in desertum Damasci*, comp. Jos. xviii. 21, xii. 10; Deut. iv. 41, and denote the environs of Damascus, for this still very important city, situated in a great plain on the river Barady, the Chrysorrhoas of the ancients, borders in the south and east on the wilderness, see Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2, p. 284 ff., Winer R.W. i. p. 286 ff.—מָשַׁח to anoint stands improperly, as Judg. ix. 8, for the Divine consecration, indicated by anointing, to the office of king and prophet, although an actual anointing with oil nowhere occurs in the consecration of a prophet. Of the three named, Jehu only is actually anointed (2 Ki. ix. 6.) But all the three were to be instruments of God for the extermination of the idolaters in Israel. Hazael was to chastise the whole people for their apostasy (2 Ki. viii. 7), Jehu to extirpate the authors of idolatry, Ahab and Jezebel, with the prophets of Baal (2 Ki. ix., x.), Elisha to slay by the word, which as the word of the Lord must bring judgment on the godless (Jer. i. 10, xviii. 7), comp. 2 Ki. ii. 24.—V. 18. וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי וגו׳ is, according to the Hebrew accentuation, to be taken as future. I will leave 7000 in Israel, that is, preserve in the judgments to be executed by Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha, those, namely, who have not given themselves to idolatry. Elijah, therefore, is not the only true worshipper of Jehovah who remained in Israel.[1] נָשַׁק to kiss, worship, adore by kissing, partly by kissing the hand to the idols (comp. *Plin. hist. nat.* xviii. 8), partly by actual kissing of the idol on the mouth and chin, which was so usual especially in the worship of Baal, that *Cic. in Verr.* iv. 43 says of the brazen statue found in the temple of Hercules at Agrigentum: *Simulacrum . . quo non facile quidquam dixerim me vidisse pulcrius, usque eo, judices, ut rictus ejus et mentum paullo sit attritius, quod in precibus et gratulationibus non solum id venerari,*

[1] The apostle Paul certainly in citing this passage in Rom. xi. 4, renders וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי grammatically not quite exactly by κατέλιπον, but has taken the expression in its original, not, as Fritzche *ad h. l.* asserts, in a different sense, to prove, that notwithstanding the present rejection of Israel a λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος still exists; comp. Tholuck's Comm. on the passage in the new edition of 1842.

*verum etiam osculari solent.* The number 7000 is a round sacred number of the ἐκλογή of the covenant-people remaining in Israel,[1] for seven is the signature of the covenant, comp. Bähr, Symbl. i. p. 193, Hengstenb. Gesch. Bil. p. 71.

Vv. 19—21. After this revelation Elijah, newly strengthened in his wavering faith, finds at Abel-meholah, in the valley of the Jordan, the son of Shaphat, Elisha, ploughing in the field with twelve yoke of oxen, and calls him to the prophetic office by the symbolical act of casting his prophetic mantle on him, whereupon he left the oxen and ran after him, praying that he might kiss his father and his mother, that is, take leave of them and then follow him. By the mention of ploughing with twelve yoke of oxen, it is made manifest that Elisha was an affluent man, who gave up his earthly goods to consecrate himself to the service of the Lord, and thus was eminently adapted for the office to which he was called by a faith denying that which is earthly.[2]—On the form אֶשְּׁקָה comp. Gesen. Lehrg. p. 306, Ew. Gr. § 294. The answer of Elijah לֵךְ שׁוּב וגו' can only mean: "Go, but return soon, for it is a great thing that thou shouldst be my successor. *Cogita, ad quantum munus te vocaverim. Grot.*—V. 21. Hereupon Elisha returns and takes the yoke of oxen with which he himself ploughed, slays them (זָבַח *immolavit)*, boils the flesh, in doing which he uses the plough tackling for firing (as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 22), and, after he had thus given the people, that is, his

[1] Köster i. p. q. p. 75 finds herein an allusion to the army of 7000, with which Ahab (xx. 15) conquered. This reference *Ephr. Syr.* mentions as assumed by many without deciding in favour of it. Should this be so, we are by no means to conceive the reference so grossly, as if the 7000 men composing the army of Ahab were the same with the 7000 true worshippers of God here mentioned, but only so that in both places the number 7000 is used to denote the whole covenant people then existing in Israel. With this distinction, however, that in our verse the 7000 actually denote the ἐκλογὴ τοῦ 'Ισραήλ, while in xx. 16 it only represents it.

[2] It is possible, as Hengstenb., Beitr. ii. p. 144, assumes, that this circumstance was noticed, "because the lower calling was an emblem and type of the higher," that "the twelve yoke of oxen represent the twelve tribes, and Elisha is to be prophet, not for the ten tribes alone, but for all Israel." At all events Christ, Lu. ix. 62, uses ploughing as an emblem of labouring for the kingdom of God with almost evident allusion to this occurrence.

acquaintances, a parting meal, follows Elijah as his minister. הַבָּשָׂר is an explanatory apposite to the suff. ם in בִּשְּׁלָם. See other explanations in *Ludov. de Dieu crit. ss. ad h. l.*

---

## CHAPTER XX.

### AHAB'S VICTORY OVER BENHADAD.

Vv. 1—8. Benhadad, son of the Benhadad, who under Baasha had seized several towns of Galilee (xv. 20), invades Israel with thirty-two vassal-kings and his whole military force, lays seige to Samaria, and demands of Ahab entire submission. The thirty-two kings "with him" (אִתּוֹ) were not kings confederate with him, but, as may be inferred from v. 24, vassals or viceroys, lords of single cities and their districts—as in Joshua's time in Canaan almost every city had its own king, so that Joshua vanquished and slew thirty-one Canaanitish kings (Jos. xii. 7 ff.)—whom Benhadad had subjugated, so that they with their troops were obliged to follow their lord to the field.—v. ff. During the siege he sends messengers to Ahab and demands his silver and gold and the best of his wives and children. The pusillanimous Ahab promises to yield to his request. Rendered still bolder by this weak compliance Benhadad (v. 5) sends messengers a second time with the announcement, that to-morrow about this time he would send his servants to him to search his house and the houses of his servants, and fetch away all his treasures. That this second demand appeared to Ahab greater than the first is manifest from this, that he now lays the matter before the elders of the land and asks their counsel (v. 7.) But in what is the second demand different from the first? Is it merely in this, that Benhadad wished to search and plunder the houses of his servants also, as Seb. Schm., Schulz, Maur. and others think? Scarcely. Much rather in this, that Benhadad wished to plunder Samaria (Kimchi.) The first demand, "thy silver and gold is mine, and thy wives and children, the best, are mine," was ambiguous.

Ahab had so understood it, that he demanded mere submission and acknowledgment of his supremacy by the payment of a tribute in gold and silver and the surrender of a part of his harem and his children. But Benhadad had certainly from the first required unconditional surrender at discretion: Ahab however discovers this only from the second demand, and therefore only then lays the matter before the elders of the land for deliberation, by whom he is dissuaded from compliance (v. 8).—כִּי אִם (v. 6) means neither *sed, but,* nor *ideo,* nor is it a form of oath or strong asseveration = *certainly* (Ew. Gr. § 625), but אִם signifies *if,* and כִּי introduces the sentence, as the כִּי in v. 5, and is only repeated for the sake of emphasis (Maur.)[1] מַחְמַד עֵינֶיךָ, "all that is pleasant in thine eyes," that is, all thy treasure. V. 7. "Mark now and see, that this man seeketh mischief"—*non tantum iniquissima postulat, sed mala quævis nobis intendit* (J. H. Mich.):—As he is not content with the first demand, which I did not refuse him. That moreover Ahab reported the second demand, as it is understood of itself, is not expressly remarked.

V. 9—11. When the refusal, which Ahab gave to the messengers by the advice of the elders, is brought to Benhadad, he endeavours by repeated sending of messages with boastful menaces so to intimidate Ahab, that he may still surrender unconditionally. Boasting of his innumerable army he threatens with an oath to destroy Samaria. The meaning of the oath: "the dust shall assuredly not suffice for the hollow hands of all the people in my train" (v. 10), is differently understood. The Chald., Rashi, S. Münster, and others understand שְׁעָלִים of the sole of the feet (*vola pedis*), according to which the Chald. paraphrases the sense thus: *Si suffecerit pulvis Somron, ut feratur soleis plantarum pedum populi qui mecum est.* But this meaning of שֹׁעַל cannot be verified, as the word in the other two passages in which it elsewhere occurs, Is. xl. 12; Ezek. xiii. 19, signifies the hollow hand. Accordingly the menace can only have the sense: "As thou dost not concede to me the seizing of thy trea-

[1] Similarly Winer in the Lex. p. 474 and Ges. *thes.* ii. 681: *quod ad te nisi . . scito, servos meos, si cras misero, inquisituros esse. . .*

sures, so will I assuredly cover Samaria with so great an army, that its dust will not suffice for my soldiers, if each should only take a handful. Whether Benhadad, however, by this hyperbole threatened only the total spoliation of Samaria or its entire reduction to ashes, so that scarce a handful of dust should remain of it, is a matter that can scarcely be determined.[1] Ahab answers (v. 11) this hyperbole with the proverb, אַל יִתְהַלֵּל וגו׳ *ne glorietur qui se accingit æque ac qui se discingit*, for which the Latins say, *ne triumphum canas ante victoriam*, "the victory must be won before it is celebrated."

V. 12. On this answer Benhadad gives the command to attack the city, while he drank with his vassal kings in the tents. סֻכּוֹת are not ordinary tents of canvass, but tents or booths of branches, boughs, and brushwood, which were erected for the kings in the camp, as they are still erected for the Turkish pashas and agas in their expeditions; see Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 198 f.—שִׂימוּ take your places, set yourselves in array, comp. 1 Sam. xv. 2, where שִׂים has unquestionably this meaning, as שִׁית in Is. xxii. 7 and Ps. iii. 7, where Hengstenb. has erroneously controverted it.

V. 13, 14. While the Syrians are preparing for the attack, a prophet[2] meets Ahab and announces to him, the Lord will to-day deliver this great multitude into thine hand, and that too by the armour-bearers of the princes of the provinces (שָׂרֵי הַמְּדִינוֹת), therefore by a small feeble troop, *per turbam imbellem* (Grot.) will he smite the countless host of the proud Benhadad, that Ahab may know that the Lord grants him the victory. *Οὐ χρήζω πλήθους, φησὶν, ἐγώ. ἐν ὀλίγοις γὰρ μειρακίοις καὶ πολέμων ἀπείροις τὴν παμπόλλην ταύτην στρατιὰν διολέσω.* Theod. —מִי־יֶאְסֹר, "who shall open the war or battle? Thou." Ahab

[1] At all events Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 14, 2) explains the words incorrectly, namely, that Ahab threatens, *ὑψηλότερον τῶν τειχῶν, οἷς καταφρονεῖ, χῶμα τούτοις ἐπεγείρειν αὐτοῦ τὴν στρατιὰν κατὰ δράκα γῆν λαμβάνουσαν*, although Procop. of Gaza agrees with him.

[2] The unnamed prophet in vv. 13, 22, 28, likewise the scholar of the prophets mentioned v. 35—the latter also by Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. 14, 5)—is taken by the Rabb. for the prophet Micaiah, the son of Imlah; without any historical ground, however, but evidently only by conjecture derived from xxii. 8.

is not to wait until he is attacked, but first to attack the foe. אָסַר מִלְחָמָה corresponds to our, *join battle*, engage with any one, 2 Chr. xiii. 3.—V. 15. *'Αριθμήσας γοῦν 'Αχαὰβ τριάκοντα καὶ διακοσίους εὗρε, διὰ τούτων ὁ παντοδύναμος Κύριος τριάκοντα καὶ δύο βασιλέων διέλυσε στρατιάν.* Theod.

Vv. 15—20. At the word of the prophet, Ahab, after numbering his army, draws it out at noon, the armour bearers of the princes of the provinces in front (בָּרִאשֹׁנָה.) Apprized of this Benhadad commanded in drunken insolence, as he still caroused with his vassals, to take alive the men marching out of Samaria, whether they come in peace or in war. Meanwhile the Lord granted strength to every Israelite to slay his man, and the Syrians made their escape, Benhadad himself only escaping the Israelites pursuing him on a horse with horsemen, that is, with horsemen surrounding him. עַל־סוּס וּפָרָשִׁים, Schulz erroneously explains, *equis mutatis alternis.*

Vv. 21, 22. After Ahab had thus through the help of the Lord given the Syrians a great defeat, the same prophet, who had predicted to him the victory, appears again before him and warns him to be on his guard, because the Syrians would again, with the new year, commence hostilities. לִתְשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה, "at the return of the year," that is, in the next spring, at the beginning of the new year, when after the cessation of the winter rains campaigns were wont to be commenced, 2 Sam. xi. 1.

Vv. 23—25. But the ministers of the Syrian king seek to persuade him to a new expedition, because they ascribe the defeat sustained to two causes, which they think they will be able to obviate in future. The one cause they find in this, that they had come to an engagement with the Israelites on a mountainous region, on which their enemies were supported by their gods. "Their gods are gods of the hills," say they according to their polytheistic notions of religion; fighting with them on the hills we have to fight against the might of their gods; therefore shall we encounter them on the plain, where the aid of their gods will not avail. This idea, flowing from the narrowness of heathenism, they derived no doubt from this, that Samaria itself was situated on a hill, and the God of Israel had not only given the law to his people from Mount Sinai, but also was worshipped in his

lawful sanctuary at Jerusalem, on Mount Moriah, and unlawfully elsewhere on the altars of the high places. Heathenism had, besides, hill-gods, that is, deities, who ruled on mountains and guarded and directed all that took place on them (comp. *Dougt. Anal. ss.* i. p. 178 f., *Deyl. observ. ss.* iii. p. 197 ff. Winer, R.W. i. p. 108 f.), as also, especially in Syrophœnicia, particular mountains were themselves divinely worshipped, comp. Mov. d. Phöniz. i. p. 667 ff.—But the ministers of Benhadad were not wrong in this, that they ascribed their defeat to the aid which God had given to his people Israel, but only in this, that they took the God of Israel for a mere local deity, as their own gods were, who besides, as inanimate beings, were unable to put forth any power either on the mountains or in the plain. They might not be altogether wrong in this, that they laid the second cause of the unfortunate issue of their expedition to the charge of the vassal kings. Perhaps they had spared their people and been the first to take to flight. They therefore advise the king to dismiss altogether these petty kings and put captains (פַּחוֹת, see x. 15) in their stead. These prudently devised measures, however, avail them nothing, for they are to learn, that the God of Israel is no limited hill-deity.

Vv. 26—30. With the new year (comp. v. 22), Benhadad recommences the war with the siege of Aphek. The situation of this Aphek is much disputed. Contrary to Rosenm., who identifies it (Althk. ii. 2, p. 96), with the Aphek belonging to the tribe of Asher at the foot of Lebanon (Jos. xiii. 4; xix. 30; Judg. i. 31), which is preserved in the village Afka, between Baalbek and Byblus, and is probably the old Ἄφακα on the river Adonis (see Ges. *thes.* i. 140), v. Raumer (Pal. p. 120), has rightly observed: "as the battle of Benhadad was certainly not in the range of Lebanon, but most probably in the plain of Jezreel (1 Ki. xx. 23—25); so Benhadad is taken in Aphek, not of Asher, but of Issachar, which lay in the valley of Jezreel." J. D. Mich., Gesen. (l.c.) and Winer (R.W. i. p. 78), on the contrary find our Aphek in the great castle *Apheca* near Hippo, mentioned by Euseb., which still exists as a village with two hundred families on the east side of the sea of Galilee, under the name فيق or افيق, see Ges. on Burckhardt's Travels, i. p. 539, v. Raum. Pal. p. 234. Even the locality, however, speaks

against this. This Aphek lies not only very high, but has also a very difficult mountain pass, where the Syrians, who feared the hill-gods of the Israelites, would not have come to an engagement with them. If we reflect besides that the Syrians had advanced the first time as far as Samaria, we cannot doubt that this time also they advanced far, and that our Aphek is the Aphek known by the victory of the Philistines over Saul in the plain of Esdraelon (comp. 1 Sam. xxix. 1 with xxviii. 4), in the tribe of Issachar, according to the *Onomast.* situated near Endor, in the greatest plain of Palestine, where from Joshua's time to that of Napoleon so many great battles have been fought.[1] .V. 27. כָּלְכְּלוּ, "they were supplied with ammunition and provisions." S. Münst., Vatabl., and S. Schm., falsely, *integro numero abierunt* or *omnes congregati sunt nemine excepto*, deriving כלכל after the *Rabb.* from כֹּל.—The Israelites pitched before them (in sight of the Syrians) as two little flocks of goats separated from the great herd (חֲשִׂפֵי עִזִּים comp. on חָשִׂיף *segregatum, parvus grex segregatus*, Ges. *thes.* i. 531.) Probably the Israelites had pitched their camp on one of the mountain-slopes of the plain of Jezreel, from which they appeared to the Syrians filling the land as a pair of miserable flocks of goats.—V. 28. To the host of Israel, so inconsiderable in comparison with the number of the enemy, the Lord by a prophet announces the victory, that the Syrians may learn that the God of Israel is the Almighty God, whose power is not confined to the hills, but extends equally to the valleys. When, therefore, after the two hosts had pitched the one over against the other seven days, they came to an engagement, 100,000 Syrians were totally slain. *Notandum, quod Deus non propter pietatem Iisraelis et Achabi, sed propter gratiam suam Syros percusserit.* Seb. Schm.—V. 30. Of the fleeing Syrians 27,000 are slain by the fall of the wall of Aphek, ἵνα δὲ κἀκεῖνοι καὶ οὗτοι μάθωσι, ὡς θεήλατος ἡ πληγή. Theod. The fleeing Syrians probably, in order to make a stand in Aphek against the pursuing Israelites, had partly climbed and occupied the city walls, and partly sought behind them a shelter for their protec-

[1] Besides those above named there is still an Aphek in the vicinity of Bethshemesh on the mountains of Judah (Jos. xv. 53), where the Israelites lost the ark in an encounter with the Philistines, 1 Sam. iv. 1.

tion; when, during the conflict around them, the walls fall by a special dispensation of God, and bury the greatest part of the Syrians under their ruins.[1] Benhadad himself escapes with his immediate followers from the ruin, and flees through the city from chamber to chamber, חֶדֶר בְּחֶדֶר here not as 2 Ki. ix. 2, *cubiculum intra cubiculum, i.e., intimum cubiculum* (*Vulg.*, C. a Lap., Vatabl., Calm.), but, from one chamber to another, see xxii. 25, 2 Chr. xviii. 24, and Lev. xxv. 53, Deut. xv. 20.

Vv. 31—34. As Benhadad knows no means of farther escape, his servants make the proposal, confiding in the compassion of the kings of Israel, to implore the mercy of Ahab for him, in order to save his life. They put mourning garments on their loins and ropes about their heads, as signs of surrender at discretion, go to Ahab and intercede for the life of their king. But Ahab found his vanity flattered, because his proud adversary, now in his power, must so humble himself before him and implore his favour, and thought that he must show his royal magnanimity by giving him his life, not reflecting how a similar proceeding of Saul was censured by the Lord (1 Sam. xv. 9 ff.) "Is he yet alive? He is my brother," says he to Benhadad's servants (v. 32.) But these took the words of Ahab as a good omen (יְנַחֲשׁוּ), and hastened to let him explain himself openly; הֲמִמֶּנּוּ *an ex ipso (pronuntiatum esset), i.e., num ex animi sententia hoc dixisset.* Maur. נִחֵשׁ *augurium (faustum) capio, οἰωνίζομαι*, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 875. The older explanations of this word see in *H. B. Stark, nott. sell. p.* 156 *sq.*—The ἅπαξ λεγ. חָלַט cognate with חָלַץ *exuere*, properly *abstrahere, nudare*, then trop. *aliquid facere nude, i.e., sine prætextu*, or *aliquid nude, i.e., sine fuco atque ambagibus testari, confirmare*, comp. Fürst's *Conc.* p. 398, in the Talmud often *simpliciter confirmare, testari*, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 476. The following words אָחִיךָ בֶן־הֲדַד "Is Benhadad thy brother?" are a repetition of the words of Ahab in the form of a question, by which the Syrians would give Ahab occasion simply to confirm his word, in order to be certain that he

[1] The old theologians find a miracle in the fall of this wall; but though we cannot mistake the finger of God in it, yet the text does not indicate the Divine causality, which would entitle us to the assumption of a proper miracle.

had spoken in sincerity, so that they might rely upon it. But Ahab does not content himself with having declared Benhadad his brother, wherein lay implicitly the guarantee for his life and friendly treatment, but causes him to come immediately and ascend his chariot. V. 34. But in order to keep Ahab in this humour so favourable to himself, Benhadad immediately promises to restore him all the cities, which his father had taken from the Israelites, and to grant to Ahab's subjects a quarter of their own in Damascus his capital, such as Benhadad's father had obtained in Samaria.[1] On this liberality extorted from Benhadad by necessity Ahab promises to conclude a treaty with him and set him free, and grants him his liberty after the treaty was concluded. The words וְחֻצוֹת תָּשִׂים וגו', "make streets for thee in Damascus," can neither be understood with Grotius of fortifications and military posts, nor of cattle roads, or commons and pasture grounds in the Syrian territory (J. D. Mich., Deres., Maur.), still less of excises and toll-bars in Damascus (S. Münst., Vatabl., C. a Lap.), but only of this, that a quarter for residence and free intercourse should be granted to the Israelites in the capital of the Syrian kingdom (Cler., Gesen. and others).

This as impolitic as untheocratic proceeding of Ahab arose by no means from a "heart naturally very good" (J. D. Mich.), but from weakness, indecision, and self-deluding vanity.[2] To set

[1] Benhadad the father had taken some towns in Galilee from the Israelites in the time of Baasha (xv. 20), but these can scarcely be contemplated here, not merely on account of מֵאֵת אָבִיךָ "from thy father," for אָב could also signify only ancestors in general, and at all events could not be used of Baasha, but still more on account of the farther remark, that Benhadad's father made streets in Samaria, which points to a war between Benhadad I. and Omri which has not come down to us, which must have occurred in the last six years of Omri, after Samaria was built for the capital of his kingdom.

[2] Cler. on v. 42 has very properly decided: *Factum itaque Achabi, quamvis clementiæ speciem præ se ferat, non erat veræ clementiæ, quæ non est erga latrones exercenda; qui si dimittantur, multo magis nocebunt, quam antea, quemadmodum re vera fecit Benhadadus. Victoriam Deus Achabo concesserat, sceleratumque regem in manus ejus tradiderat, ut de eo supplicium sumeret, non ut benigne haberet. Nec alioquin Achabus clementi ingenio erat, qui tot prophetas ab uxore Izebela trucidari passus erat.* On the contrary, G. L. Bauer (Gesch. d. hebr. Nat. ii. p. 403) finds in this a "trait, which does honour to the heart of Ahab!!"

free a cruel and faithless enemy was not only great harshness towards his own subjects, but also an obvious striving against God, who by granting the promised victory had given the enemy of his people into his hand. Even though Ahab had no express command, as Saul had regarding Agag (1 Sam. xv. 3), yet there lay upon him, if as theocratic ruler he would respect the will of the Lord, inasmuch as the Lord had given him into his hands as a despiser of his Divine Majesty, the sacred duty of securing rest for himself and his subjects by his death; as it was natural to presume, that the faithless adversary after his freedom was recovered would not adhere to a treaty formed on compulsion, which accordingly happened xxi. 1. The punishment of his striving against God is immediately announced to Ahab.

Vv. 35—43. One of the scholars of the prophets receives this commission and discharges it, so that, following the example of Nathan, 2 Sam. xii., he elicits from the king himself the judgment on his conduct. He causes himself to be wounded by another, then, having disguised himself, meets the king on the way and proposes to him the following fable. In the battle with the Syrians another had delivered to him a prisoner to keep under the threat, that, if he let the prisoner escape, he should either answer for him with his life or pay a talent of silver, and the prisoner had now escaped him.—As to the particulars it is asked, why, did the scholar of the prophets cause himself to be smitten and wounded? Some think, merely to make himself unknown, against which v. 38 speaks. Seb. Schm. says, *ut fingere posset, quasi ita percussus et tantum non interfectus esset ab eo, cujus captivum dimisisset.* This also is scarcely the right ground, because the prophet does not mention his wound to Ahab. The wounding was to be much rather a symbolical sign, a practical prediction to Ahab of that which he was about to suffer from the released Benhadad, as has been observed by C. a Lap., Calm., Schulz, and Maur.—The refusal of the scholar of the prophets to smite his colleague in office at his word is severely (v. 36) punished; but we are to remember, that, as he was summoned thereto בִּדְבַר יְהוָה (see on this at xiii. 2), his refusal was an obvious resistance of a servant of the Lord to the command of his God, which was so severely punished as a warning to others, like a similar act of disobedience in xiii. 24, in the man of God

from Judah. V. 38. וַיִּתְחַפֵּשׂ, "he disguised himself with the head band over his eyes," that is, he made himself unknown by putting on a head band. On this meaning of חָפַשׂ to search, in *hithp.* to make oneself be searched for, therefore to disguise oneself, especially by dress, comp. xxii. 30, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8, 2 Chr. xviii. 29.—אֲפֵר is not ashes (אֵפֶר), as Syr., Vulg., Luther, Grotius, etc. explain, but = עֲפֵר, in the Chald. מַעְפְּרָא, in LXX. τελαμών of the head band, Ges. *thes.* i. 140 f.—v. 39. סוּר depart, turn from the way to one, as Ex. iii. 3, Judg. xiv. 8, Ruth iv. 1, etc.—הִפָּקֵד to be missed, as פָּקַד to miss, 1 Sam. xx. 6, 18, xxv. 15, Jer. iii. 16, etc. The Arab. فقد has the same meaning, comp. Hävern. on Ezek. p. 606. A talent of silver = (2618 pr. rixd.) £342, is a sum not to be procured by a poor man, so that he must certainly have answered with his life for the prisoner escaped.—V. 40. עֹשֶׂה הֵנָּה וָהֵנָּה "to be busy here and there," to have to do here and there, so that the change, proposed by Dathe, of עֹשֶׂה into שֹׁאֶה is unnecessary.—To this complaint of the unknown man Ahab answers: כֵּן מִשְׁפָּטֶךָ וגו׳, "so thy judgment—thou hast decided," that is, even already thy judgment pleases me well, thou must bear the penalty named. V. 41 f. The prophet had expected this decision. By removing the head band he makes himself known to Ahab, and applies the approved judgment to himself, when he announces to him the word of the Lord, "because thou hast let go the man whom I had cursed, therefore thy life shall go for his life and thy people for his people," that is, therefore upon thee and thy people shall the punishment fall, which thou hast failed to execute on Ben-hadad. אִישׁ חֶרְמִי the man of my curse, who is laid by me under the curse, who should have been put to death according to the law, Lev. xxvii. 29. On the idea and nature of the curse comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 453 ff.—V. 43. As Ahab, being not unacquainted with the law, knew what was imported by the חֵרֶם, which the prophet hereby implicitly pronounced upon him, he went to his house[1] סַר וְזָעֵף, "vexed and dis-

[1] According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xv. 5) Ahab must have vented his vexation and displeasure on the prophet and cast him into prison, which however is only inferred from xxii. 8 and 26. Comp. the note on xx. 13.

pleased." סַר from סרר to be obstinate, refractory, denotes dissatisfaction with what had occurred, therefore vexed, moody, comp. xxi. 4, 5.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### SEIZURE OF THE VINEYARD OF NABOTH AND HIS SHAMEFUL EXECUTION BY AHAB.

Vv. 1—4. After Ahab had concluded peace with the Syrians, the desire seized him of appropriating to himself a vineyard, which Naboth the Jezreelite possessed at Jezreel beside the royal palace, in order to turn it into an herb or vegetable garden. But Naboth wishes neither to sell the inheritance of his fathers nor exchange it for another vineyard. Provoked at this Ahab goes to his house and abandons himself wholly to his vexation, laying himself on his bed, and taking no food. To judge aright of this narrative it is before all things to be remembered, that Naboth's refusal to alienate his vineyard to the king did not proceed from obstinate self-will, but had the religious ground, that the law of Moses strictly forbade any Israelite to sell his paternal inheritance, and, even in case of the greatest poverty, only permitted its sale on the condition that it could be redeemed at any time, and, if this was not done, in the year of jubilee it reverted freely to the original owner or heir, Lev. xxv. 13—28; Num. xxxvi. 7 ff.[1] Naboth was thus in his denial not merely entitled by his personal right, as J. D. Mich. says, but bound by the Divine law, to decline the demand of the king, which interfered with conscience. But Ahab, whom we have hitherto found to be the direct reverse of a "good man with the best intentions" (J. D. Mich.) remains here also true to his character, and shows himself a man sold under sin (v. 20), who failed however in the requisite energy of purpose, to display the iniquity of his

[1] Hengstenberg (Beitr. ii. p. 129 f.) has made the remark, that this whole narrative is only intelligible by this key, and drawn from this the right conclusion, "that the Mosaic law had very firm roots in Israel."

heart in effective action. The answer of Naboth (v. 3): חָלִילָה לִּי מֵיהוָה "that be to me far from the Lord," that is, God forbid that I . . . , is by no means "extremely rude" (Mich.), but a simple expression of repugnance to an act contrary to the law of God, and could no more hurt Ahab than in general the imputation of a wrong does the sinner. If he therefore exhibits his vexation and displeasure in a childish manner, so that he lays himself on his bed, turns his face from the bystanders (*more tristium, qui conversationem, colloquium et conspectum hominum fugiunt et declinant.* Seb. Schm.) and will not eat, this discovers no better disposition than if he forthwith carried out his will in a tyrannical manner and forcibly seized the coveted good. Had he not been of too imbecile a character, he would no doubt have himself done that which he leaves his bold consort to perform.

Vv. 5—7. As soon as Jezebel learns the cause of his vexation, she upbraids him with his want of energy in acting, and at the same time promises to procure for him the coveted vineyard.—On סָרָה comp. xx. 43.—אַתָּה עַתָּה תע׳ מל׳ "thou, exercise only thy royal power over Israel," that is, act as king, use the power, which is at thy command as king over Israel. The words are neither ironical nor to be taken as a question, but a simple summons to action, in which no doubt is implied a tacit censure of his imbecility.

Vv. 8—10. Jezebel now writes a letter in the name of Ahab, seals it with his seal, to give it the character of a royal mandate (Esth. viii. 12; Dan. vi. 17),[1] and sends it to the elders and nobles of Jezreel.—From the addition אֲשֶׁר בְּעִירוֹ (v. 8), which is explained and rendered more emphatic still by הַיֹּשְׁבִים אֶת־נָבוֹת "who dwelt with Naboth," and from the like opposition in v. 11, we are not to conclude, that Jezreel was only the birth-place and paternal city of Naboth, where he had his inheritance, but not his usual residence (J. D. Mich.); much rather are these additions made, because Ahab and Jezebel,

[1] The seal probably contained the name of the king, which was impressed on the document by the seal instead of a subscription; as is done at present in Egypt and Persia by the Turks and Arabians, comp. Paulsen. d. Regier. d. Morgenl. p. 295 ff. and Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 205 f.

although they had a palace in Jezreel and resided there at times, yet at that time were in their proper residence Samaria, to indicate that the letter was sent directly to the elders of that city, because they were more fit than any other persons to execute the wickedness of Jezebel, inasmuch as they, dwelling with Naboth in his home, that is, together with him in the same city, had occasion to observe his manner of life, and might have themselves naturally heard the blasphemy of God, with which he was to be charged.[1]—V. 9 f. In the letter Jezebel commands the elders to proclaim a fast in the city, to assemble the people, to set Naboth at the head of the people, and to set over against him two worthless men as witnesses, who should assert that he blasphemed God and the king, and then to stone him as a blasphemer. A public fast is ordained, not in order thereby *δεῖξαι τοῦ φόνου τὸ δίκαιον* (Theod.), but to show, that a heavy guilt lies upon the city, which must be expiated. Fasting as an external sign of repentance presupposed a grievous offence, on account of which men humbled themselves before God (1 Sam. vii. 6.) By this order also the external appearance of justice would be given to the process in the eyes of the whole city, and the stamp of truth antecedently impressed on the trangression, of which Naboth was accused. To preserve the appearance of justice, two witnesses also are set up, as the law required in capital offences, Deut. xvii. 6 f. xix. 15; Num. xxxv. 30; and Michael. Mos. R. vi. § 299, but worthless men, as in the accusation of Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 60.—בֵּרַכְתָּ וגו׳, "thou hast blessed God and the king," that is, bid them farewell, taken leave of them, that is, in substance blasphemed God and the king.[2] Only

[1] That Ahab actually dwelt at that time in Samaria, and therefore came to Jezreel only to ask the vineyard of Naboth, but after the refusal of this request returned again to Samaria, appears not only from xx. 43, but also from this, that Jezebel sends her letter to Jezreel (v. 8) and the elders of this city after the execution of her bloody order send the intelligence of Naboth's death again to her (v. 14), which would not have been necessary, if she had been at that time residing at Jezreel. But that this order was executed at Samaria, as Dereser assumes, follows neither from v. 16 nor from vv. 18, 19.

[2] This is obviously the meaning of בֵּרֵךְ in Job i. 5, ii. 5. But in Ps. x. 3 it means to bless," as Hengstenb. on the passage has proved.

on this supposition, that to "bid God farewell," according to general opinion, was equivalent to "blaspheming God," could Naboth be put to death by the application of the law: Thou shalt not curse God, nor revile a prince among thy people (Ex. xxvii. 27). The penalty for this offence is certainly not stated in the passage quoted, but was determined in practice by analogy, Mich. M.R. vi. § 295. As the law, Deut. xiii. 11, and xvii. 5, punished idolatry as a practical denial of God with stoning, so could blasphemy be visited with no less a penalty. Blasphemy of God and the king is here mentioned as in the law, Ex. xxii. 27, not as two independent offences, but as internally connected. Blasphemy of the king as the visible representative of God in his kingdom was *eo ipso* also blasphemy of God.

Vv. 11—13. That the elders of Jezreel, instantly complying with the command of the queen, show themselves ready for her ungodly commission, presupposes deep moral degradation as well as slavish fear of her detestable tyranny. The assumption of Vatabl. and others, that Jezebel sent her order *non ad omnes, sed certos quos sciebat esse impios aut sibi morigeros* is contradicted by the generality of the expression, "to the elders and nobles of the city," and does not really improve the matter, as long as the better disposed, as we must then assume, tacitly

But this learned man goes too far when he (Beitr. ii. p. 131 f.) quite denies to the word בֵּרֵךְ the meaning "to curse," and maintaining only the meanings, "to bid farewell to, renounce," will explain our passage by this, that through בֵּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים וָמֶלֶךְ the blasphemy forbidden in Exod. has been reduced to the general idea of neglect, in order to be able to apply the prohibition concerning idolatry to this particular case. This assumption loses all probability from the consideration, that in this case the whole process would have lost much of its legality in the eyes of people, as a great part of the people, with the king and queen at their head, had openly neglected God and served Baal. If the charge בֵּרַכְתָּ אל׳ ומ׳ had in the general opinion only the meaning, "thou hast neglected God," it would have appeared arbitrary and unrighteous to punish one, not the remainder, who had in fact still more notoriously and boldly neglected God. The signification of a word is often so modified by the speech usage gradually moulding itself, that it assumes a meaning, which does not lie immediately in its etymology. Thus בֵּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים "to bless God, bid him farewell," has received *per euphemismum* the meaning, to imprecate, blaspheme."

assent to the commission of the offence, without raising their voice against it. V. 13. וַיְעִדֻהוּ "they witnessed against him (Naboth.)"—הֵעִיד is here and v. 10 construed with the *Accus.* instead of בְּ, Am. iii. 13 etc., as often the construction of verbs vacillates between the use of the *acc.* and the preposition, comp. Ew. Gr. p. 324.

Vv. 14—16. As soon as Naboth's execution was announced to the queen, she calls upon Ahab to take possession of his vineyard. As according to 2 Ki. ix. 26 Naboth's children were put to death with him, the king could confiscate his goods according to a right sanctioned, not certainly by the law of Moses, but by usage (comp. 2 Sam. xvi. 4, and Mich. M.R. i. § 59), which was probably derived from the identification of the offence against sovereignty with that against God. As in the latter offence the goods of the offender fell as חֵרֶם to the Lord (comp. Deut. xiii. 16, and Mich. M.R v. § 246), so in the case of the offenders against sovereignty their goods were regarded as forfeited to the king. V. 16. וַיָּקָם וגו' "Ahab rose up to go down (from Samaria to Jezreel) to the vineyard of Naboth."

Vv. 17—19. As Ahab stands in the act of taking possession of it, Elijah the Tishbite, at the command of God, meets him with the words; "Hast thou killed, and also taken possession?" (The question stands *loco affirmationis emphaticae, q. d. utique occidisti et possedisti etiam.* Seb. Schm. after Luther) and according to the *jus talionis* announces to him the penalty, that the dogs shall lick his blood in the same place in which they licked that of Naboth. But according to xxii. 38, this took place not in Jezreel, but in Samaria. In order to bring the prophecy into full harmony with its fulfilment, many (Grot., Maur., de Wette and others), after the example of Gousset, explain בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר by *pro eo quod,* "inasmuch as," while Dereser thence concludes, that Naboth was stoned in Samaria. Both are equally arbitrary. The prophecy is literally fulfilled not in Ahab, but in his son (2 Ki. ix. 25) from the Divine forbearance in consequence of his repentance, v. 27 ff.—אֲשֶׁר בְּשֹׁמְרוֹן (v. 18) denotes Samaria as the usual residence of Ahab, not that he is there at the moment Elijah meets him; for as to this it is immediately added, "he is in the vineyard of Naboth, whither he is

gone down."—גַּם־אַתָּה (v. 19) is an emphatic repetition of the *pron. suff.*, "thy, even thy blood;" see Ew. Gr. § 560.

Vv. 20—24. Ahab endeavours to take the sting from the prophet's speech by the address; "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy,"[1] that is, dost thou meet me again, mine enemy, to bring me evil tidings. He calls Elijah his enemy, in order to weaken the force of his baleful message. But Elijah answers without fear: "I have found (thee), because thou hast sold thyself to do evil in the eyes of the Lord," and (v. 21) immediately announces to him the Divine sentence as to the extirpation of his whole house. הִתְמַכֵּר וגו' "to sell oneself to do evil" is to surrender oneself without a will to evil, so that sin exercises the uncontrolled power of a master over man as his slave, comp. v. 25, 2 Ki. xvii. 17; Rom. vii. 14.—V. 21. מֵבִי for מֵבִיא, as in this verb especially the א often falls away, see v. 29, xii. 12; 2 Sam. v. 2; Mic. i. 15; Jer. xix. 15, xxxix. 16.—For the remaining words see xiv. 10.—On v. 22 comp. xv. 29 f., xvi. 3, 12 f.—Although Jezebel was included in the house of Ahab, yet the most ignominious death is specially denounced against her, which actually befell her according to 2 Ki. ix. 30 ff. בְּחֵל יִזְרְעֶאל ἐν προτειχίσματι (LXX.), in the moat of Jezreel. חֵל is properly the open space by the town wall, *pomoerium*. There is no occasion, therefore, for the change of חל into חלק (*Castal.*), which is not warranted by the more general expression חלק, which is used for it, 2 Ki. ix. 36. On v. 24 comp. xiv. 11.

In vv. 25 and 26 the writer again gives parenthetically the reason why this ignominious end was announced to Ahab and his whole house. הֵסַתָּה after the form of verbs עע for הֵסִיתָה comp. Ew. Kr. Gr. p. 473 not. 1.

V. 27—29. The severe threatening makes so much impression on Ahab, that he, for a short time at least, feels true repentance, for which the Lord in his great compassion mitigates the punishment denounced in this, that the extirpation of his house is to take place, not in his own life time but in that of his son (2 Ki.

[1] Luther renders these words, after the *Vulgata*: "Hast thou ever found me thine enemy?" Incorrectly, as H. B. Stark, *l.c.* p. 157 ff. has shewn at length.

ix. 25.)—The rending of the garments, the putting on of hair cloth (שַׂק), and fasting, are the outward signsof humiliation before God, of bitter sorrow for sin and of genuine repentance. On the rending of the garments as a sign of deep grief of soul among the Hebrews and other Oriental nations, comp. *Dougt. Anal. ss.* i. p. 117 f., and Winer, R.W. ii. p. 414. Ahab does not leave it off even by night, as a sign of earnest repentance, although it had no true conversion for its issue, because sin, to which he had sold himself, soon smothered again all the better feelings of his heart.[1] וַיְהַלֵּךְ אַט "and went slowly along," as one deeply troubled. אַט means *lente, leniter*, not *gemebundus*, still less *discalceatus*, as Chald. Syr. and Josephus (Ant. viii. 13. 8) expound the word.

## CHAPTER XXII.

WAR RENEWED WITH THE SYRIANS, AND AHAB'S DEATH, VV. 1—40. REIGN OF JEHOSHOPHAT IN JUDAH, VV. 41—51, AND OF AHAZIAH KING OF ISRAEL, VV. 52—54.

Vv. 1—4. For three years after that great defeat of Benhadad (xx.) there was no war between Israel and Syria.[2] Ahab then concerts with Jehoshaphat King of Judah, in a visit which the latter paid him in Samaria in the third year of the conclusion of

[1] The old theologians for the most part regard the repentance of Ahab as hypocrisy or as purely external; but this is opposed by v. 29, according to which the Lord himself acknowledges his humiliation before him, and therefore grants a reprieve of the threatened sentence. Vatabl. is correct: *poenitentia haec fuit vera sed temporaria.* Comp. also Seb. Schm. *ad h. l.* and *Buddei hist. eccl.* ii. p. 329.

[2] Altogether without grounds, Köster, d. Proph. p. 78, attaches the first verse of our chapter to the preceding section, and then finds therein a hint for the understanding of the transaction recorded, xxi. 17—29, between Elijah and Ahab, from which he concludes that this scene is an "Agadah entirely designed for edification," which is to "demonstrate the proposition," "that even kings do not violate with impunity the demands of justice, and that the consequences of reformation are for the benefit of the whole land."

peace, a common expedition against the Syrians to Ramoth Gilead, because Benhadad had not fulfilled the conditions of peace, had not surrendered, as he promised, xx. 34, all the cities of Israel taken by his father, but had retained Ramoth in Gilead, in order to recover this city from them.[1] On Ramoth, comp. iv. 13.—The words of Jehoshaphat (v. 4): "I am as thou, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses," that is, I, with my people and my horses, am at thy disposal, contain his assent to the common expedition about to be undertaken, and therefore in 2 Chr. xviii. 3 instead of the last words there is וְעִמְּךָ בַּמִּלְחָמָה, "I am with thee in the war."

Vv. 5—8. Before the war is undertaken, Jehoshophat wishes to learn the word of the Lord concerning it, and Ahab assembles his prophets, about 400 men, who all, as with one mouth, prophesy a fortunate issue of the war. These 400 prophets were neither the 400 prophets of Asherah (xviii. 19 f.) who did not appear before Elijah on Carmel, nor the prophets of Baal, as many old expositors thought, for by these Ahab could not enquire אֶת־דְּבַר יְהוָֹה, but *prophetae vitulorum*, that is, prophets of the kingdom of Israel, who complied with the calf-worship, gave themselves out as prophets of Jehovah worshipped under the symbol of the calves, came forward, therefore, of their own accord, without a Divine call, and were, if not in the pay, at least in the service of the idolatrous king of Israel. Jehoshaphat, therefore, does not acknowledge them as the true prophets of Jehovah, and enquires if there were none such. Ahab (v. 8) then names to him Micaiah the son of Imlah, but with the remark that he hates him,[2] because he never predicts to him good but only evil.[3] Ahab had certainly known him already as a prophet of misfortune, and as appears from v. 26, had imprisoned him, obviously on account

[1] The parallel to our chap. in 2 Chr. xviii. 2—34, furnishes an account of this expedition agreeing herewith almost word for word.

[2] According to Josephus and the Rabbins this Micaiah should have reproved Ahab in the former war with the Syrians on account of the liberation of Benhadad (xx. 41—43.) Comp. the note on xx. 13.

[3] As Ahab here speaks of Micaiah, so Agamemnon addresses Calchas in Homer.

> *Μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπες!*
> *αἰεί τοι τὰ κάκ' ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι*
> *ἐσθλὸν δ' οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος, οὔτ' ἐτέλεσσας.*

of a prediction that was disagreeable to him. He wishes, therefore, no longer to consult him. His hatred to him is founded in the belief connected with heathen views of prophecy and conjuration, that the prophets stood in such a relation to the divinity, that the latter fulfilled their will. Ahab, therefore, fears that Micaiah will revenge himself on him for putting him in prison, by not only predicting misfortune, but inducing his God actually to inflict on him that which the prophet wishes and desires.[1]

Vv. 9—12. As Jehoshaphat was of a different opinion with regard to the prophets of the Lord, he so appeases Ahab, that the latter sends for Micaiah. Meanwhile the prophets of the calves come forward to prophesy success before the two kings, who sat in royal attire on thrones in an open space before the gate of Samaria. מְלֻבָּשִׁים בְּגָדִים "clothed in garments," can only mean, in royal garments, in royal array. גֹּרֶן *locus complanatus*, usually the threshing floors, which it is well known among the Hebrews, as to this day in Palestine, were only open level places; comp. Paulsen, on the Ackerb. der. Morgenl. § 40, Niebuhr, Reise in Arab. i. p. 151 f., Rob. Pal. ii. p. 520, 720, iii. p. 6, 201, 271 etc.—V. 11. In order to make their prophesying more impressive, one of these prophets, Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah, supports his word by a symbolic action, in which, embodying the figure used by Moses in the blessing of Joseph (Deut. xxxiii. 17): "His first born ox is gloriously adorned (*videbatur intelligere cornua, quæ sunt decor boum. Cler.*) and buffalo-horns are his horns; with them he pushes nations together to the ends of the earth" (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 131), he makes for himself horns of iron, and applying the glorious promise specially given to the tribe of Ephraim, to the present case says: "Thus hath said Jehovah; with these (horns) shalt thou push Aram, till thou have destroyed him." While he in

[1] This belief, which among the heathen was a pure superstition with regard to their prophets, and even in Ahab was mingled with superstition, had been produced by the observation, correct in itself but only falsely understood by the heathen, that the predictions of true prophets were actually accomplished; and was therefore not so foolish as it must appear to those who see nothing in predictions but purely human presentiments of a sagacious politician without all objective Divine foundation.

this manner promises Ahab the most certain victory, he does not reflect, that the fulfilment of the whole blessing of Moses depended on the condition of true fidelity to the Lord and his commandments, which the idolatrous Ahab had been far from fulfilling.[1]—V. 12. עֲלֵה—וְהַצְלַח go up and do prosperously = go up and thou wilt do prosperously, success will attend thee. Comp. on this use of the second imperative Ew. Gr. § 618.

Vv. 13—18. The messenger, who brings Micaiah, endeavours by the way to persuade the prophet to accord in his prediction with the words of the other prophet, and to announce success to the king, probably with the well meant intention of effecting his release from prison and saving him from severer punishment. But Micaiah, mindful of his Divine commission, rejects decidedly this ungodly counsel even though arising from a well wishing heart, solemnly affirming that he will only speak what Jehovah may say to him (vv. 13, 14.) Appearing before the king, he answers to his question, "Shall we go against Ramoth in Gilead to war, or shall we forbear?" in the same words as the prophets of the calves; comp. v. 15 with v. 12. On this statement agreeing word for word with the prediction of the false prophets, and no doubt also in their tone, Ahab remarked that his prediction was no sincerely meant word of the Lord, but ironical; and adjured him therefore to speak only truth in the name of the Lord (v. 16.) Then Micaiah announces to him what he had seen in the Spirit: "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd," together with the word of the Lord: "these have no master, let them return every man to his house in peace" (v. 17.)—If Zedekiah endeavoured to confirm his prophecy by a symbolical ascription of success to the undertaking of Ahab, so Micaiah showed the king from the law what would actually occur in the contemplated war, namely, the condition which Moses, after his own end was announced to him as nigh at hand, wishes to avert from Israel, when he says to the Lord: "Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation, who may go out and in before them,

[1] Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 131 ff. has already remarked how entirely our narrative rests on the Pentateuch, and presupposes acquaintance with it in the kingdom of Judah.

and who may lead them out and in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd" (Num. xxvii. 16 f.) Israel will lose his master (אֲדֹנִים), that is, Ahab will fall in battle against Ramoth in Gilead, his army, deprived of its shepherd, will be scattered on the mountains of Gilead, and then every man will return to his house בְּשָׁלוֹם, that is, without being pursued or destroyed by the enemy.

Vv. 18—23. Although Ahab had desired a true word of the Lord, yet he pays no attention to it, but again traces the unpalatable communication to the personal enmity of the prophet to himself, since he says to Jehoshaphat: "Did I not tell thee he would prophesy no good concerning me, but evil?" Micaiah, however, does not allow him to deceive himself in this way, but unfolds to him by a farther communication of the revelation made to him, the concealed ground of the false prophesying of his 400 calf-prophets. That he had in spirit seen the Lord sitting on his heavenly throne, surrounded by the heavenly hosts on both sides,[1] and asking, who will seduce (יְפַתֶּה) Ahab to go to the battle against Ramoth, that he may fall there. After one proposed this counsel and another that, the Spirit of prophecy came forward with the proposal, to seduce Ahab as a lying spirit in the mouth of his prophets to undertake the war. Accepting this proposal, Jehovah has now put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these prophets, and spoken evil concerning him (vv. 19—23.)—The symbolic form of this vision is no subjective arbitrary embellishment of the prophet, as with all the rationalists, Knobel i. p. q. i. p. 422 f., and Köster i. p. q. p. 80, imagine, but a simple representation of the spiritually real vision, in which the truth was revealed to the prophet, that the prophecy of the calf-prophets was given by a lying spirit to destroy Ahab. Rightly recognising this the older theologians, however, for the most part erred in supposing הָרוּחַ, that as a lying spirit inspired the false prophets, to be Satan. For הרוח with the def. art. can neither signify Satan κατ' ἐξοχήν, nor *diabolum quempiam* (C. a

[1] עֹמֵד עָלָיו (v. 19) "standing about him, properly over him." The ministers standing behind or even beside their sitting Lord are raised above him, and thus appear to the beholder as standing over him, Is. vi. 2, Gen. xviii. 8.

Lap.), nor *aliquem ex Satanæ familia* (Grot.) הָרוּחַ is rather the personification of the principle of prophecy, abstracted from the distinction between true and false prophecy. Only so far as this רוּחַ acts as a רוּחַ שֶׁקֶר, is it πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, τῆς πλάνης (Zech. xiii. 2; 1 Joh. iv. 6), that stands under the influence of Satan. For even the predictions of the false prophets, as appears not only from our passage, but also from Zech. xiii. 2, and the doctrine of Scripture elsewhere concerning the spiritual principle of evil, are no mere forms of human reason and fancy; but the false prophets, as well as the true, stand under a spiritual principle lying beyond their nature, and are, according to the Divine arrangement, in the service of falsehood under the influence of the evil spirit, as the true prophets in the service of the Lord are moved by the Holy Ghost. Comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 320 f., and Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 201 ff. This supernatural influence of the lying spirit on the false prophets is so brought to view in the prophetic vision, that the spirit of prophecy (רוח הנבואה) presents itself as רוח שקר in the false prophets to deceive Ahab. Jehovah sends this spirit, because the seducing of Ahab is inflicted on him as a judgment of God for his unbelief. But that this lying spirit proceeded from Satan is not intimated here, because the object is only to exhibit the Divine government in the deception destined for Ahab through his prophets.—Besides, the old theologians did violence to the text, when they explained the expressions: "Jehovah said, who will persuade, seduce Ahab" (פִּתָּה to persuade one to something, mostly in a bad sense, therefore, to seduce); "persuade him, thou wilt be able also; go forth and do so" (vv. 20, 22), and "Jehovah hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets" (v. 23), by the idea, foreign to the Holy Scripture, of a passive Divine permission, as we find it in Theodoret and others.[1] According to Scripture God orders the evil

[1] Theodoret thus explains himself: Ταῦτα δὲ προσωποποιΐα τίς ἐστι, διδάσκουσα τὴν θείαν συγχώρησιν, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἀληθῶς Θεὸς καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας διδάσκαλος προσέταττεν ἀπατηθῆναι τὸν Αχαὰβ, ὁ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου εἰπὼν, εἰ κυρίως αὐτοὶ πρὸς Θεὸν, ἀναστραφήτω δὴ ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἐν εἰρήνῃ. διὰ τούτων τοίνυν ὁ προφήτης ἐδίδαξεν, ὡς τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀπάτης, ὀργάνοις χρώμενον τοῖς δυσσεβέσιν ἀνθρώποις, ψευδῶς ὑπισχνεῖται τὴν νίκην. τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται τοῦ Θεοῦ συγχωρήσαντος. κωλῦσαι γὰρ δυνάμενος, οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν, ἐπείπερ

also, without on that account willing or producing sin. At the root of the prophetic vision lies the thought, that Jehovah has ordered it, that Ahab, misled by a prediction given to his prophets by the lying spirit, should undertake the war, that he may therein be punished for his ungodly conduct.[1] As he did not wish to hearken to the word of the Lord in the mouth of his true servant, God has given him over (*παρέδωκεν*, Rom. i. 24, 26, 28) in his unbelief to the influences of the spirit of lies. But that thereby human freedom is not destroyed is evident from the תְּפַתֶּה "thou wilt persuade him," still more from the גַּם תּוּכָל "thou wilt also prevail" (v. 22), since the former, still more the latter, presupposes the possibility of resistance to temptation on the part of man, and therefore human freedom.

Vv. 24, 25. By this fearless disclosure as to the lying spirit moving the false prophets, Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, probably their coryphæus, is so provoked, that he smites Micaiah on the cheek and says, "which way went the Spirit of Jehovah from

ὁ Ἀχάὰβ τῆς θείας ἦν κηδεμονίας ἀνάξιος. So also Procop. of Gaza. Comp. also *Pfeiff. dubia vex. Cent.* ii. 439 f. and Budd. hist. eccl. ii. p. 332.

[1] How little the notion, so much employed by the older theologians, of the Divine permission (*συγχώρησις, permissio*) corresponds with the expressions of the Holy Scripture concerning the omnipotence of God ordering and directing evil also, is generally acknowledged by the deeper evangelical theology of our day. Thus for example, Twesten (Vorles. ü. d. Dogmat. ii. p. 130) says: "Nothing certainly can be clearer to the religious consciousness than the principle, that sin lies not in God, in a Divine willing and working, but only in the creatures that have of their own free will departed from God. But equally evident is the principle, that without God's willing and working, nothing, not even that will of evil spirits and men departing from God, can be." Comp. with this H. Olshausen's discussion of this point in his bibl. Comm. iii. p. 323 ff. especially p. 326 ff. Still more decidedly has Hengstenb. combatted the notion of permission, as an idea not only foreign to Scripture, but in itself untenable and by no means solving the difficult problem of the relation of human freedom in the sinner to the Divine predestination (Beitr. iii. p. 462 ff.) Lastly, with singular clearness has J. Müller (d. christl. Lehre v.d. Sünde i. p. 291 ff.) explained how "God undoubtedly stands in a living influential relation to evil in the creature, subjecting it to his orders and at the same time adapting his universal plan to it, directing its development, and assigning to its appearance in the world of reality the plan which eternal wisdom has provided for it," while at the same time it leaves untouched the principle, "that the efficient causality of evil as evil lies altogether in the creature."

me to speak unto thee?" This proceeding shows on the one hand that the prophecy of the false prophets was no mere fiction, but a suggestion of a lying spirit, but on the other hand it bears witness to the weakness of their cause. Zedekiah could only come forward so boldly, because he was conscious to himself of this, that he had not feigned his oracle; but had he been inspired by the Spirit of the Lord, he would not have needed to use physical force to give validity to his word, but might have quietly awaited the issue of the affair, as Micaiah did, who calmly replies to the zealot: "thou shalt see in that day, when thou shalt go from chamber to chamber to hide thyself." This sentence was obviously fulfilled in the issue of the war, when Ahab's followers and friends, or his wife Jezebel herself, made the false prophets suffer for the misfortune. On חֶדֶר בְּחֶדֶר see xx. 30.

Vv. 26—28. But Ahab sends Micaiah back (comp. הֲשִׁיבֻהוּ v. 26) to the town jail with the order to feed him with bread and water of affliction (that is, with scanty prison fare), until he return בְשָׁלוֹם in safety from the war, whereupon Micaiah, in consciousness of the Divine truth of his prediction, calmly but firmly replies: "If thou return in safety, the Lord hath not spoken by me. Hearken, all ye people." Although these last words שִׁמְעוּ עַמִּים כֻּלָּם are directed to the people only, the expression is very general. The whole world is to be witness of the battle between the true and false prophets, which was to be decided by the issue of Ahab's campaign.

Vv. 29—33. Disregarding the prediction of Micaiah, Ahab undertakes the war in conjunction with Jehoshaphat, of whom it might have been expected, that he at least would have hearkened to the word of the prophet. But probably he was prevented by false shame from retracting his promise of aid unconditionally made to Ahab merely on account of a prophetic announcement, which Ahab had repeatedly ascribed to the prophet's personal dislike to himself. But this had well nigh cost

[1] The younger prophet of this name, Micah (i. 2), begins his prophecies with the same words, in order thereby to represent his activity as the continuation of his elder copartner in office and name, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 239 f.

Jehoshaphat his life.[1] For as the Syrian king had commanded the thirty-two captains of his chariots to fight singly and solely with the king of Israel, in order probably to avenge himself on his enemy on account of the former defeat received from him, although Ahab had then treated him generously beyond his merit or expectation (xx. 32 ff.), and Ahab, whether it was that he had been apprised by spies of this order, or that the message of Micaiah boded nothing good to his evil conscience, had disguised himself, while Jehoshaphat had not;[2] the captains of the Syrian chariots, as soon as they saw Jehoshaphat in royal apparel, broke in upon him with the notion that he was the king of Israel, and Jehoshaphat could only save himself by a cry, on which the Syrian chariot warriors seem to have discovered that he was not the king of Israel, and turned away from him. How far Jehoshaphat owed his escape to his cry is not stated. It is not probable

[1] Even after his safe return to Jerusalem he had to hear the rebuke of the prophet Jehu: "Shouldest thou help the ungodly and love them that hate the Lord? Therefore wrath comes upon thee from the Lord," 2 Chr. xix. 2.

[2] Luther has quite missed the sense of the words הִתְחַפֵּשׂ וָבֹא בַּמִּלְחָמָה וגו' (v. 30) inhis translation, "disguise thyself, and come into the battle having put on thy robes. But the King of Israel disguised himself also," whereas he rendered the same words in the parallel passage 2 Chr. xviii. 29 quite correctly: "I shall disguise myself and go into the battle, but do thou put on thy robes. And the king of Israel &c." This contradiction has been already remarked by Stark *l.c.* p. 160. הִתְחַפֵּשׂ וָבֹא are not imperatives, but infinitives absolute, which, as Maurer aptly expresses himself—*per regiam ut ita dicam negligentiam*—are used for the first person of the *voluntative*, properly for the *imperative*, but so that the speaker commands himself, comp. Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 560 and hebr. Gr. §. 583. On the import of התחפש see xx. 38.—Stark *l.c.* finds in these words of Ahab a *vafrities Achabi, regi Josaphato astute periculum intentantis suumque exitium perfide in caput illius derivare conantis*, whereupon Schulz and Maur. broach the suspicion, that Ahab designed after the death of Jehoshaphat to seize upon his kingdom. But this conjecture seems to me too low and unworthy even for the bad character of Ahab, so that I cannot impute to him such a design. The imperative, "put thou on thy robes" can only convey the meaning, thou mayest put on thy royal apparel, thou dost not require measures of precaution, as I do, because misfortune has not been predicted to thee, nor do the Syrians entertain any special hatred against thee.

that he called out his own name. (Cler.) Seb. Schm. thinks, he cried, *corde ad Dominum, voce ad suos, ut sibi subsidio venirent, ita ut intelligerent etiam Syri, quod rex Judæ esset.* For the supposition that his cry was a cry to the Lord for help, we might appeal to the addition, 2 Chr. xviii. 31, "and the Lord helped him, and God moved them from him;" but this cannot be concluded with certainty, as this addition contains nothing more than a pious reflection of the narrator, which refers to the supernatural causality of the deliverance (comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 316.) So much only is certain, that the cry was the natural means of his escape, as the Syrians thereby discovered, that he was not the king of Israel whom they sought.—וַיָּסֹרוּ עָלָיו "they turned to him" (v. 32), comp. on סוּר xx. 39.

V. 34. Notwithstanding his precaution Ahab does not escape the Divine judgment; although he could not be recognized by his dress, yet he was hit by an arrow shot quite unintentionally, and mortally wounded. לְתֻמּוֹ *pro simplicitate sua, h. e. sine ullo delectu et citra propositum feriendi regem* (J. H. Mich., Schulz, Maur.) תֹּם *integritas*, then *simplicitas animi*, here and 2 Sam. xv. 11.—בֵּין הַדְּבָקִים וּבֵין הַשִּׁרְיָן "between the joints and the harness." Cleric. understands by הדבקים *cammissuras, quibus ferreus thorax conjungitur cum pendentibus laminis, quibus venter tegitur*, the part which the French call le défaut de la cuirasse. It is possible, however, that דבקים may here denote a part of the body, namely, the shoulder, see Ges. *thes.* i. 313.—הֲפֹךְ יָדֶיךָ *verte manus tuas*, that is, turn round," comp. 2 Ki. ix. 23. ידיך according to the *Kettibh* is plural.

Vv. 35—38. When the battle became hotter, the wounded Ahab, in order not to discourage the troops by his removal from the field, and thereby lose the battle, was kept during the day standing in his chariot in view of the Syrians until evening, when he expired. וַתַּעֲלֶה הַמִּלְחָמָה, "the war or battle ascended," increased, became hotter. The use of the verb עלה for the increasing conflict is explained by the figure, lying at its foundation, of a river rising, and with the rising becoming ever more rapid; comp. Is. viii. 7. הָיָה מָעֳמָד, "he was stayed," was kept standing. The participle with היה expresses the continuance of the action or state, Ew. Gr. § 350.—V. 36 f. About

sunset the war cry went through the host, to return every man to his city and to his country. But Ahab was carried dead to Samaria, and there buried. V. 38. Here when his chariot, into which his blood had flowed, was washed in the pool of the city, the dogs licked his blood, while the harlots bathed in the pools. Thus were the word of the Lord by Elijah (xxi. 19) and the unnamed prophet (xx. 42), and at the same time the prediction of Micaiah (xxii. 17) fulfilled. Without a shepherd and without a master the people returned home (v. 17); Ahab had paid his life for the spared life of Benhadad (xxi. 42), and his blood was licked by the dogs (xxi. 19.)[1] Very differently are the words הַזֹּנוֹת רָחָצוּ (v. 38) interpreted, comp. *Pfeiff. dub. vex.* p. 441. At all events we must reject the interpretations of זֹנוֹת by *arma* (Chald. Syr.) or *habenae* (R. Levi ben Gers., C. a Lap., Calm., and others.) הַזֹּנוֹת can only be the subject of the sentence, and have its usual meaning *meretrices;* but it may be disputed whether רָחַץ here have the intransitive meaning, to wash oneself, bathe, or the transitive, to wash (the chariot.) Against the argument, urged by Schulz in favour of the first and against the second view, that in the latter case כִּבֵּס must have been inserted, because רחץ is always used *de corporis lotione*, Maurer has replied, that according to the analogy of the Arab. رحض, which also denotes the washing of clothes, the Hebr. רחץ too may stand in a wider sense, and has decided for this: *videtur de ablutione currus hic eo facilius dici potuisse, quod de curru sanguine hominis cruentato sermo est.* But although this reasoning may still be strengthened, inasmuch as רחץ denotes also the washing of the slain victim (Ex. xxix. 17, Lev. i. 9, 13), of the defilment of sin (Is. iv. 4), but כבס, because it denotes not merely to wash, but properly to full, may certainly be used of the washing of

[1] Gramberg in his so-called "Kritischen Geschichte der Religionsid. d. A. T." ii. p. 460, finds indeed in this reference of the writer to the expression of Elijah (xxi. 19), a reason for declaring it suspicious, because the dogs licked the blood of Ahab at Samaria, but that of Naboth at Jezreel; but a few lines farther he believes it necessary to conclude from this, that in the expression, xxi. 19, we have directly the original words of Elijah, and are at liberty to reject the remainder of the prophecy (xxi. 21—24), as unhistorical merely on account of its perfect agreement with the fulfilment. Such after-criticism corrects itself!

clothes (Lev. xv. 10 f.) but not of the washing of a chariot, yet here also רחץ cannot denote the washing of the chariot, because (*a*), if רחצו be transitive, only the immediately preceding אֶת דָּמוֹ, not the very remote אֶת־הָרֶכֶב, can be supplied to it as object, but in this case the washing of the blood ought to have been mentioned before the licking of it by the dogs; and (*b*), the washing of the chariot has been already stated in the words וַיִּשְׁטֹף אֶת־הָרֶכֶב "and one washed the chariot," and שטף is the proper term for the washing of such an article, on which uncleanness adheres only externally, comp. Lev. xv. 12.—That the dogs licked the blood, and the harlots bathed in the pool, when the chariot defiled with the blood of Ahab was washed, is mentioned as a sign of the ignominious contempt with which the blood of Ahab was treated.[1]

Vv. 39, 40. Of the buildings of Ahab mentioned v 39 all farther accounts are wanting. The palace overlaid with ivory (בֵּית הַשֵּׁן) he erected probably in Samaria, his residence, or even in Jezreel.

Vv. 41—51. *History of the reign of Jehoshaphat of Judah.* Of this the accounts in our books are particularly scanty; much more copious is the abstract made from the annals of the kings in 2 Chr. xvii. 1—xxi. 3.

Vv. 41—45. Verses 41—44 are also found with little variation in 2 Chr. xx. 31—33, in the recapitulating summary of the reign of Jehoshaphat.—V. 43. "Jehoshaphat walked in all the ways of Asa his father, and turned not aside from it," as Asa had done, whose heart in the latter years of his reign was more and more estranged from the Lord, comp. xv. 18 ff.—On v. 44 comp. xv. 44, 2 Chr. xx. 33, and my apol. Vers. p. 290.—V. 45. "And

[1] In this respect the bathing of the harlots in the pool belongs also to the fulfilment of the predicted ignominious end of the godless king, although this special trait was mentioned by no prophet, but not in the farfetched way, in which Köster i. p. q. p. 80 brings about the connexion, when he seeks it in this, that the remark, "the harlots bathed," may refer to the fact, that "the Hebrews are wont to call the unchaste dogs," (Rev. xx. 15), and the narrator would as it were say: "whom the first literal fulfilment by the licking dogs does not suit, let him turn to the second figurative one, for the harlots bathing may also be meant by the dogs."

Jehoshaphat made peace with the king of Israel," whereas hitherto the two kingdoms had always stood in a hostile position to one another. Indeed Jehoshaphat proceeded still farther, as by the marriage of his son Jehoram to Athaliah, a daughter of Ahab, he allied himself with the idolatrous royal family of Israel, 2 Chr. xviii. 1, and in consequence of this joined in the above mentioned expedition against the Syrians as the confederate of Ahab.

Vv. 46—48. Of his valiant deeds, which he did (גְּבוּרָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה v. 46) are mentioned in 2 Chr. xvii. 1—19, xix. 4—11, his labours for the defence of his kingdom by the establishment of forts and organization of forces, as well as by the extirpation of idolatry and the promotion of the worship of Jehovah by means of instructing the people in the law, and of his wars, besides that already mentioned, the victorious expedition against the Moabites, Ammonites, and other tribes joined with them, who had invaded the country, in 2 Chr. xx., on which compare my apolog. Vers. p. 241 ff.—On v. 47, comp. xv. 12 and xiv. 24. V. 48. "And there was no king in Edom; a deputy was king," that is, ruled the land. The last words נִצָּב מֶלֶךְ׃, concerning which Schulz and Hitzig have formed unnecessary conjectures (comp. Maur. *ad h. l.*) are explained by the deputy in Edom bearing also the title of king, see 2 Ki. iii. 9. The Edmonites were subjugated by David (2 Sam. viii. 14), and, as the designs of revolt formed by Hadad under Solomon were not realized (comp. remarks on xi. 21 f.), remained subject to the kingdom of Judah till the time of Jehoshaphat, when they joined the Ammonites and Moabites in war against Judah (2 Chr. xx. 10—22), but were smitten by and with their confederates and thus again conquered.

Vv. 49, 50. After Jehoshaphat had again subjugated the rebellious Edomites (comp. וְאַחֲרֵי־כֵן, 2 Chr. xx. 35), he attempted to renew the trade carried on by Solomon to Ophir and Tartessus, and with this view built ships of Tarshish at Eziongeber (comp. ix. 26) to sail to Ophir, but the ships were wrecked by a storm in harbour (v. 49.) At that time Ahaziah of Israel wished to join him in the prosecution of this trade; but Jehoshaphat did not consent (v. 50.) The reason of this we learn from 2 Chr. xx. 35—37, which furnishes an important help to the elucidation of this matter. According to this Jehoshaphat had at first

actually joined Ahaziah in the building of a fleet, which, being constructed at Eziongeber, was to proceed to Tartessus, but was wrecked. Jehoshaphat entered into this partnership, because only in this way was the trade to Tartessus possible to him, as this fleet was not, as J. D. Mich. assumes, to circumnavigate Africa, but to be transported from Eziongeber across the isthmus of Suez,[1] and from one of the havens of Palestine on the Mediterranean Sea, all of which belonged to the kingdom of Israel, to make the voyage to Spain. This partnership the prophet Eliezer had censured, and announced as a Divine judgment the wreck of the ships, which accordingly followed before a voyage was undertaken. When Jehoshaphat, after the failure of the first attempt, resumed the plan of building merchant ships, he declined Ahaziah's proposal again to join him in the undertaking, lest he should thereby incur anew the Divine displeasure, and built ships for himself alone after the manner of the former designed for the trade to Tartessus (אֳנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ, v. 49), which, however, were to go to Ophir, because by breaking off his treaty with Ahaziah the havens of the Mediterranean were shut for the trade to Tartessus; but he was compelled to desist from this undertaking also, because the newly built ships were wrecked in the creek of Eziongeber, which abounds in rocks.[2]—עָשַׂר, v. 49,

[1] As Cleopatra afterwards wished to convey her whole fleet over this isthmus, and as in ancient times whole fleets were often transported over necks of land. See abundant proofs of this in my Schrift über d. Hiram-Salom. Schiffahrt, p. 9 ff.

[2] That the above quoted passage of Chronicles is thus supplementary of our verses, I have already proved in my Apolog. vers. p. 308 f., and my Treatise u. d. Hiram-Salom. Schiffahrt p. 21 f. against the uncritical confusion of the two accounts proposed by Bredow and adopted by all rationalists; only that I there placed the building of the ships destined for Ophir, which is mentioned in our verses before the building of the fleet destined for trading to Tartessus undertaken by Jehoshaphat in common with Ahaziah, which is related in Chronicles; whereas, after repeated examination, the development given above in the text of the relation of the two narratives appears to me more correct. But therewith all the arguments unfolded in the treatises quoted for the diversity and mutual independence of the two narratives remain in force; and the ignoring of the same on the part of the rationalistic criticism, for example by Tuch in the Hall. A. L. Z. 1835, No. 80, and by Winer in the bibl. R.W. ii. p. 703, only proves, that this criticism is more interested in the maintaining of its prejudices than in the discovery of the truth. But the scruple, which Hävern. (Einl. 2, 1, p. 237) raises against it, appears to me to be quite unimportant.

is an error of the pen for עָשָׂה.—The *Keri* נִשְׁבְּרוּ is an unnecessary amendment of the *Kethibh* נִשְׁבְּרָה, as in these cases the singular of the verb is by no means rare, comp. Ew. Gr. § 568.

Vv. 52—54. *Reign of Ahaziah*, son of Ahab, king of Israel. According to the prevailing spirit the reign of Ahaziah quite resembles that of his godless father, comp. xvi. 30—33. These verses, moreover, would more suitably begin the following chapter, as in it every particular concerning the reign of Ahaziah is contained, which the author of our books has extracted from the annals of the kings. V. 54 contains no internal reason either for the conclusion of the chapter, or much more, for the close of the first Book of Kings.

# SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.

## CHAPTER I.

### AHAZIAH'S SICKNESS AND DEATH.

V. 1. The Moabites were subjected to the Israelites by David, 2 Sam. viii. 2, xxiii. 20, and in the partition of the kingdom remained tributary to the kingdom of the ten tribes. After the death of Ahab they revolted from the kingdom of Israel. This took place obviously in the alliance, mentioned 2 Chr. xx., with the Ammonites and other tribes dwelling beyond the Ammonites in the desert of Arabia for war against the kingdom Judah. For this war occurred after the death of Ahab (2 Chr. xx. 1) and before the building of the fleet of merchant-men begun by Jehoshaphat in conjunction with Ahaziah, which was scarcely more than a year from the death of Ahab, as Ahaziah did not reign longer than a year and a half. More concerning this revolt of the Moabites, see in iii. 4 ff.—Ahaziah could do nothing to reduce them to subjection, as he soon became very ill in consequence of a fall.

V. 2. "And Ahaziah fell down through a lattice in his upper chamber in Samaria." Whether הַשְּׂבָכָה "the lattice" means the parapet of the flat roof (מעקה Deut. xxii. 8) on the side of the house, where the עֲלִיָּה was built on the roof (comp. Faber's Archaeol. i. p. 410), or a kind of window of the עליה, through which Ahaziah fell down, cannot be with certainty determined. Most of the Rabbins understand by it a lattice work in the

Alijah built on the roof, through which the light shone into the lower chamber.—In his illness Ahaziah wishes to obtain from Baal-zebub the god of Ekron[1] an answer, whether he will recover. בַּעַל זְבוּב means the fly-Baal, as averter of vermin, as tutelary god against flies, similar to the *Ζεὺς ἀπομυῖος*, *μυίαγρος* of the Eleans (*Pausan.* viii. 26, 4, v. 14, 2, *Plin.* x. 40, xxix. 24, *Aeliani hist. anim.* v. 17), and the Myiagrus Deus Romanorum (*Solin. Polyh. c.* 1); comp. *Seldeni de Diis Syr.* ii. *c.* 6, Ges. *thes.* i. 225, Winer, R.W. i. p. 139, Mov. d. Phoen. i. p. 175.[2]

[1] Ekron (עֶקְרוֹן) was the most northern of the five cities of the Philistines, situated between Ashdod and Jamnia, bordering on Judah in the low lands; at present a village without any relic of antiquity. See von. Raum. Pal. p. 183, Rob. Pal. iii. p. 329 ff.

[2] Others, as Jas. Scaliger, Grotius, Hävern. (Comm. on Ezek. p. 75) explain the name בַּעַל זְבוּב as a name of contempt, distorted from בַּעַל זְבוּל Lord of the heavenly dwelling (comp. Hab. iii. 11), which corresponds with the heathen name of the Phœnician, Lybian, and Punic Baal בעל שָׁמַיִם Balsamen of Augustine, called Βεελσάμην by *Sanchun.* (comp. Ges. *monum Phœn.* p. 387, and Mov. i. p. q. p. 176.) In favour of this might certainly be the circumstance, that the later Jews changed the prince of demons mentioned in the New Testament Βεελζεβούλ (to which name the same signification certainly belongs, see Mov. p. 255, 261, 287), by a combination of זְבוּל with זֶבֶל, into a *deus stercoreus*, comp. Lightfoot, *hor. hebr. et talm. in Mat.* xii. 24, and Wettstein, *N. Test. ad Mat.* x. 25. But against it are the considerations, (*a*) that this change belongs only to a later age, when a strongly repressed and openly manifested abhorrence of idolatry was regarded as genuine piety and holiness, but the change, quoted in proof from the Old Testament, of בֵּית אֵל into בֵּית אָוֶן (Hos. iv. 15), is not quite analogous, inasmuch as Ahaziah could not have designated a deity, whose aid he was seeking, by a name of contempt; (*b*) that the other special names of Baal, as בַּעַל בְּרִית, Baal of the covenant = Ζεὺς ὅρκιος, Judg. viii. 33, etc. בַּעַל פְּעוֹר Num. xxv. 3 ff. express particular properties or modifications of a general Baal; and lastly (*c*) that the flies in the East are an incomparably greater plague than with us (comp. Michael. *Syntagm. Comment.* ii. p. 98, Oedmann, verm. Samml. iv. .p 80 ff., Winer bibl. R.W. i. p. 440, Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. und Aeg. p. p. 114 f.), so that a god might certainly be worshipped as the averter of this vermin, and designated accordingly.

Vv. 3, 4. From the angel of the Lord Elijah receives the commission to go to meet the messengers of the king, to ask them whether they went to Baal-zebub because there was no God in Israel, and to announce to them that Ahaziah will not rise again from his bed, but die. The consultation of a god was not merely a transgression of the fundamental law of the theocracy (Ex. xx. 3; Deut. v. 7), but an entire practical rejection of the Lord. The Lord therefore announces death to him from his hurt, that he may perceive therein a judgment for his idolatry. —מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה is not some angel,[1] but the angel of the Lord, who effects all manifestations of the invisible God to the covenant people; comp. Hengstenb. Christol. i. 1, p. 219 ff., against which Hofmann's objections (Weissag. u. Erfüll. i. p. 127 ff.) avail nothing.

Vv. 5—8. The messengers of Ahaziah do not recognize Elijah, but still regard the matter so important, that they return and mention it to the king, who immediately recognizes Elijah the Tishbite from the *habitus* of the man described to him in answer to his questions. מֶה מִשְׁפַּט הָאִישׁ, "what was the manner of the man?" מִשְׁפָּט denotes here and Judg. xiii. 12 neither merely *forma* (תוֹאַר Rabb.) nor *consuetudo et mores*, but in general (*a*) judgment, (*b*) right, *quod justum, legi consentaneum est*, then (*c*) the right dependent on an internal principle of life variously modified according to the individuality of men and nations, the internal and external peculiarity of a person, that which in some measure constitutes the vital law and right of individual personality. So in the passages named. The servants of the king certainly describe the prophet only according to his external *habitus*, but the external in a man of character is only a picture of the internal, so that from the external we may reason to the internal. They describe him as a בַּעַל שֵׂעָר *vir pilosus, hirsutus.* But this refers, as expositors uniformly remark, not to the hair of the beard or body, but to the hairy garment, composed of sheep or goat skin or of camel's hair, with which his body was covered, the אַדֶּרֶת ii. 8 and 1 Ki. xix. 12, or אַדֶּרֶת שֵׂעָר, μηλωτή (Zech. xiii.; Matt. iii. 4; Heb. xi. 37), which the prophet wore, not as

[1] As Köster d. Proph. p. 81 assumes, and draws therefrom arbitrary conclusions.

a mere ascetic, but as *sermo propheticus realis*, as a symbol of sorrow for the sins of the people and the Divine judgments thereby incurred; comp. Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 324.—To this garment also belonged the leathern girdle אֵזוֹר עוֹר, ζώνη δερματίνη (Mat. iii. 4), whereas the girdle of the other Hebrews consisted of linen or cotton stuff, not seldom also of very costly materials, comp. Winer R.W. i. p. 525.—On the literature of the prophetic costume see Knobel, d. Prophetism. i. p. 47.

Vv. 9—12. After the delivery of his message to the messengers of Ahaziah, Elijah had retired to the top of a hill; whether to Carmel, as most interpreters conclude from ii. 25 and 1 Ki. xviii. 42, can neither be proved nor disproved. But the king must have known his place of sojourning; for he describes it to the captain (עַל רֹאשׁ הָהָר, v. 9), whom he sends with fifty men to fetch him thence, but not *ut cum eo de morbo suo loqueretur* (Seb. Schm.), but *ut eum trucidaret.*—To the summons of this captain, "Man of God, the king hath said, Come down!" Elijah answers: "If I be a man of God, then let fire come down from heaven and consume thee and thy fifty." And scarcely was the word spoken, when the miraculous judgment fell upon them, and immediately after upon a second captain with his fifty in like manner (v. 11 f.) But wherein consisted the grievous crime of these captains and their men, who merely executed the command of their master? According to the simple words of the text in the address, man of God. Most interpreters say, the captains had used this designation in a contemptuous or ironical sense. But this is not satisfactory. Two cases are conceivable: either the captains held Elijah to be no true prophet, and then their address as an insult to the prophetic office in the person of a man, whom God had acknowledged by so many miracles as his servants, was an indirect insult to the Lord: or they held Elijah to be a true prophet, and then the summons to surrender himself, in order to be led bound to the king, was a direct and still more daring contempt of the prophet as well as of the Lord his God. In either case, therefore, the punishment was just. The captains did not merely what they as servants of the king were bound to do, but shared in the ungodly disposition of their sovereign (συμβαίνοντες τῷ σκοπῷ τοῦ πεπομφότος. Theod.), and

with reckless audacity insulted the Almighty God in the person of the prophet. This wicked opposition to God the Lord is punished, and certainly not by the prophet, but by the Lord himself, who realizes the word of his servant. Whoever, therefore, on account of this act charges the prophet with cruelty,[1] does not reflect, that this charge falls not on the prophet, but much rather on God the Lord.[2] *Οἱ τοῦ προφήτου κατηγοροῦντες κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ προφήτου κινοῦσι τὰς γλώττας.* Theod.—V. 11 f. If just punishment was inflicted on the first captain for his wickedness, the second was still more deserving of the like penalty. For he not only does not allow himself to be brought to consideration by the judgment inflicted on his predecessor, but proceeds still farther in obstinacy of heart, since he does not content himself as the first (v. 9) with the simple summons: רֵדָה "come down," but with daring insolence in stronger terms calls upon the prophet: מְהֵרָה רֵדָה, "come down quickly," as if he was able to command with unlimited power.[3]

Vv. 13—16. The sending of the second, but still more the sending of the third captain, after the first and second with their fifties had been miraculously slain, shows the excessive height of the obstinacy of the king. The disaster which had befallen the first with his company, he might have ascribed in his unbelief to

[1] As Tindal, Bayle, etc., on which compare Lilienthal, d. gute Sache iv. p. 966 and viii. p. 58 f.

[2] Many incorrectly refer, in proof that Elijah has here carried his zeal too far, to Luk. ix. 54 f., where Jesus rebukes his disciples, James and John, because they wish to call down fire from heaven on the town of the Samaritans that did not receive him, as Elijah did. For the Lord here rebukes, if the words ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν, wanting in many critical authorities, and therefore removed from the text by Tischendorf, but received by Lachmann, and even if the answer of Jesus, οὐκ οἴδατε, οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς, removed from the text by both these critics, should actually be genuine,—not the conduct of Elijah, but only his disciples, who, mistaking the difference between the economy of the law and the gospel, in carnal zeal wished to imitate that which Elijah had done in godly zeal for the honour of the Lord insulted in his person. Comp. Calvin on the passage.

[3] *Impudentior fuit hic secundus Pentacontarchus priore; tum quia audito ejus supplicio non resipuit, tum quia auxit impudentiam addendo;* festina. C. a Lap.

a chance, an accidental misfortune;[1] but after the same lot had befallen the second with his men, it was scarcely possible longer to mistake the punitive hand of the Lord: yet Ahaziah wishes to carry out his wilfulness; but the third captain was better than his king and wiser than his predecessors. He obeys indeed the command of the king, so far that he goes to the prophet; but instead of contemptuously summoning him to render himself a prisoner, he rather bows his knees before the man of God, and begs the life of himself and his soldiers. Elijah, directed by the angel of the Lord, follows him to the king, and repeats to him the word of the Lord, which he had already announced to him (vv. 4, 6) by his messengers.—The *plur.* שְׁלִשִׁים (v. 13) is used because this predicate belongs not merely to שַׂר חֲמִשִּׁים, but also to חֲמִשָּׁיו. On אוֹתוֹ instead of אִתּוֹ (v. 15) comp. Ew. Gr. § 468.

Vv. 17, 18. After Ahaziah, as the Lord had spoken by Elijah, was dead, his brother Jehoram, as he had no son, succeeded him on the throne, comp. iii. 1. The statement (v. 17), that this Jehoram became king in the second year of the Jewish Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat, stands in contradiction with the statement, iii. 1, that he came to the throne in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat. Most expositors and chronologists[2] compose this difference by the assumption, that Jehoshaphat had adopted his son as co-regent in the seventeenth year of his reign. It certainly appears to oppose this arrangement, that—as Jehoram of Judah, viii. 16, became king in the fifth year of the Israelitish Jehoram, and therefore in the lifetime of his father Jehoshaphat, or in the twenty-third year of his reign, since Jehoshaphat, according to

[1] As the rationalists (Eichhorn i. p. q. p. 244, the exeget. Hdb. part 9, Bauer, hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 164 f. etc.) do, who, in order to explain the miracle, naturally appeal to the simoon and to subterranean fire accidentally breaking out, and yet find themselves at length compelled to have recourse to the assumption of a mythical distortion of the historical event by exaggerating legends.

[2] Only Bennigsen (bibl. Zeitr. p. 132) assumes two sons of Jehoshaphat with like names, and makes Jehoram *senior* become joint king in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat, and Jehoram *junior* in the twenty-third. A quite untenable expedient. Quite arbitrary also are the methods of d. Vignoles i. p. 262 and Archinard *l. c.* p. 76.

1 Ki. xxii. 42, compared with 2 Ki. iii. 1, only died in the seventh year of the Israelitish Jehoram—a twofold nomination of Jehoram to be co-regent must have taken place, which is highly improbable, inasmuch as the second nomination implies the abolition of the first, and the beginning of the reign of a contemporary Israelitish sovereign would scarcely be dated from a co-regency that was soon after abrogated ; yet this view proposed by Ussher (*Annal. M. ad a. m.* 3106 and 3112), Lightfoot (*Opp.* i. p. 83 and 85), Hartmann (*System. chronol.* p. 237), and Winer (R.W. i. p. 534), is in general right, and loses the improbability attaching to it, as soon as we distinguish between mere co-regency and actual sovereignty.[1] Jehoshaphat, in the seventeenth year of his reign, which runs parallel with the end of the twenty-first and the beginning of the twenty-second year of Ahab, went with the latter against the Syrians in the war against Ramoth in Gilead (1 Ki. xxii.) This expedition appears to have given him occasion to nominate his son co-regent, and assign to him, during his own absence from the country, the administration of the government, from which time Jehoram remained co-regent with his father. But in the twenty-third year of his reign Jehoshaphat ceded to him the entire sovereignty, on which account the eight years of the Jewish Jehoram are to be reckoned, not from the death but from the twenty-third year of Jehoshaphat's reign.[2]

[1] Ussher *l.c.* intimates this distinction somewhat differently, since he remarks on the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat: *Jos. Jehoramum filium suum proregem instituit*, and on the twenty-third: *Jehoramum cui antea vicariam potestatem communicaverat, regni secum constituit consortem.*

[2] Winer i. p. q., indeed, holds it questionable, "against all precedent, to reduce the twenty-five years of Jehoshaphat in the general computation to twenty-three;" but this is clearly demanded by the synchronism of the years of the Israelitish kings. For, if Jehoram of Israel, who became king in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat, and reigned twelve years (iii. 1), was slain at the same time with Ahaziah of Judah (ix. 24—27) and the Jewish Ahaziah reigned about one year, his predecessor Jehoram about eight, and thus the two together at all events eight full years; the Jewish Jehoram must have ascended the throne four years after the Israelitish Jehoram, that is, in the twenty-third year of Jehoshaphat, which is parallel with the fifth year of the Israelitish Jehoram. Precedents for this contraction of the years of two kings in the general computation of the duration of the regal period are no doubt wanting, as the other reductions proposed by the older chronologists, for example in the Israelitish Ahaziah, whose

The reason why Jehoshaphat ceded the sovereignty to his son two years before his death we do not know. Lightfoot (*l. c.* p. 85) finds it in the expedition which Jehoshaphat, with the Israelitish Jehoram, undertook against the Moabites who had revolted from Israel; but, as the Moabites revolted under Ahaziah immediately after the death of Ahab (see on v. 1), Jehoram would scarcely delay his warlike proceedings till the fifth year of his reign, and though the year of this campaign is not stated in chap. iii., yet it appears very evident from vv. 5—7, that Jehoram, immediately after their revolt, made preparations for war, and invited Jehoshaphat to make common cause with him.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### ASCENSION OF ELIJAH, VV. 1—18, AND THE FIRST MIRACULOUS DOINGS OF ELISHA, VV. 19—24.

Vv. 1, 2. When the time was come that Elijah should part from this earth, he found himself, with Elisha his servant and successor appointed by the Lord, at Gilgal, the seat of a school of the prophets founded by him; see the introduction to chap. iv. —To both had the Lord revealed, that now the seal was to be put to the mighty and blessed labours of Elijah by his miraculous assumption into heaven, in order to strengthen the power of faith in Elisha, the other scholars of the prophets, and all the true worshippers of the Lord in Israel; but to each apart, so that Elijah knew nothing of the fact that Elisha also had re-

years many reckon to the last years of Ahab, are arbitrary, and the case stands alone; but this very exception to the rule is intimated in viii. 16 by the words, וִיהוֹשָׁפָט מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה, "in the fifth year of Joram the son of Ahab king of Israel, when Jehoshaphat was (still) king of Judah, Jehoram the son of Jehoshaphat became king." And it is equally arbitrary in expositors and chronologists to reject the words ויהו׳ מל׳ יהו׳ as a spurious addition (see on the passage), as in others, for example, L. Capellus, des Vignoles i. p. 325, to declare the text in our passage to be here corrupt.

ceived a revelation of the same. He therefore made several attempts to release himself from his companion, not to prove his love and fidelity (*ut faceret periculum an diligeretur ab Elisaeo.* Vatabl.), but *ex modestia et humilitate* (Corn. a Lap.), because, in his great humility, he wished all witnesses of his glorification to be absent.—Setting out from Gilgal, Elijah thus speaks to Elisha: "Tarry here, for the Lord hath sent me to Bethel." But when the latter assures him with a solemn oath by the Lord and the life of Elijah, that he would not leave him, they both went down (וַיֵּרְדוּ) to Bethel (v. 2.) Gilgal is regarded by all expositors and biblical geographers as a place situated east of Jericho, towards the Jordan, where Joshua, after the miraculous passage of the Israelites through the Jordan, pitched his first camp in Canaan proper, and performed the circumcision that had been neglected since the rejection of the people in the wilderness, on the male generation that had grown up in the last thirty-eight years of the journey, from which the place received the name Gilgal, Jos. iv. 19 f., v. 9, 10. By an inconceivable oversight it has occurred to no one, that we cannot descend (ירד) from this place situated in the deep valley of the Jordan to Bethel, which lies on the mountains, that therefore this וַיֵּרְדוּ (v. 2) decidedly proves the incorrectness of the current opinion, and imperatively demands that the site of our Gilgal be sought on the mountains. An additional reason is the improbability that Elijah should have gone from a place lying east of Jericho to Bethel (thus passing Jericho), and then only from Bethel to Jericho, and thence again to the Jordan (indeed again over the supposed Gilgal, lying between Jericho and this river, or close by it.) But if we look for a Gilgal on the mountains, from which we may descend to Bethel, the passage, Deut. xi. 30, where the situation of the mountains Ebel and Gerizim is thus described; behold they lie on the other side Jordan, behind the way toward the sun-set, in the land of the Canaanites, who dwell in the plain over against Gilgal by the terebinths of Moreh; points out a Gilgal not far from the mountains Ebal and Gerizim.[1] This Gilgal still exists in

[1] After I became doubtful from וַיֵּרְדוּ (v. 2) of the correctness of the current notion of the site of Gilgal being east of Jericho, I found that Thenius in Kauffer's bibl. Stud. ii. p. 130 ff., had rejected it on the

name in the large village Jiljilia (جلجيليا), which lies upon a steep flat-topped hill, from which a very extensive view of the

grounds above adduced, and proved the identity of the Gilgal in our passage and Deut. xi. 30 with Jiljilia. But this learned man has only proceeded half-way, if he assumes, besides this Gilgal = Jiljilia, which he believes also mentioned in the prophetic passages, Hos. iv. 15, ix. 15, xii. 12; Am. iv. 4, v. 5, the existence of a town of this name east of Jericho, in the usual way, and not only makes this latter Gilgal the place of encampment of the Israelites under Joshua, *during* the conquest of Canaan, but also regards it as the town where Samuel annually judged the people, and Saul was solemnly recognized as king by the people, and afterwards rejected also by the prophet Samuel. A careful examination of the collective passages, in which, so far as known to me, Gilgal is named in the Old Testament, has satisfied me, that a city, town, or village, Gilgal, east of Jericho, towards Jordan, cannot be proved from the Old Testament, that at all events the places mentioned, Jos. iv. 19 f., v. 9 f, where Joshua encamped after the passage of the Jordan *before* the conquest of the land of Canaan, is mentioned again in the statement of the boundary of the tribe of Judah, Jos. xv. 7, as well as in the allusion of the prophet Micah to this event (Mic. vi. 5), but in none of these places is described as a town or place inhabited by men. In all the other passages—with the exception of Jos. xii. 23, where Gilgal, the capital of a Canaanitish king conquered by Joshua, is probably identical with the *villa*, mentioned in the *Onom.* art. *Gelgel, nomine Galgulis* Γαλγουλῆς) *ab Antipatride in sexto milliario contra septentrionem* (it must certainly mean *meridiem*, see v. Raum. Pal. p. 153) and with the still extant village Jiljuleh (جلجوله) according to an index of places in Rob. iii. p. 260,—the agreement of the situation of Gilgal with Jiljilia can scarcely be mistaken. So in Jos. ix. 6, x. 6, 9, 15, 43, xiv. 6, xv. 7. If, according to these passages, Joshua, after he had conquered not only Jericho, but also Ai at all events situated on the mountains, and had already advanced to Mounts Ebal and Gerizim, and there, according to the command of Moses, rehearsed the blessing and curse of the law to the people (Jos. viii. 30 ff.), pitched his camp at Gilgal, whither the Gibeonites come to beguile the Israelites into a covenant (Jos. ix. 6, x. 6), whence he attacks and slays the kings joined with Adonibezek at Gibeon (Jos. x. 7 ff.), and where afterwards the partition of the land is begun (Jos. xiv. 6), who could believe that this commander, after he had long left the valley of the Jordan and penetrated so far into the mountainous country, would retire with his whole army behind Jericho into the Jordan vale, in order to undertake farther operations? To so improbable a supposition it was then only necessary to yield, if another Gilgal had not existed in Palestine, if a Gilgal had not already been made known to Moses over against Ebal and Gerizim. But if even here any one should wish to find the most improbable probable, yet no one, although Studer indeed has done it, will desire to seek the Gilgal with the פסילים (idols or stone quarries), in its neighbourhood (Judg. iii. 19), in the Jordan

great plain beneath and of the sea is obtained, and not merely the mountains Ebal and Gerizim, lying five hours north of it, but even

valley east of Jericho, who rightly considers that Ehud—when he brings a present to the Moabite king Eglon in the city of palms (Jericho v. 13), and turns back by the פסילים in Gilgal, murders the Moabite king, then again flees beyond these פסילים to Seirath, and there on the mountain of Ephraim summons Israel to rebel against the Moabites (vv. 17—27)—cannot possibly have made his way back the first time, or the second time after Eglon's murder made his escape from Jericho to the mountains of Ephraim over the supposed Gilgal, lying ten Roman miles east of Jericho. The Gilgal, Judg. iii. 19, can thus have lain only west of Jericho. Lastly, none of the passages in 1 Sam. (vii. 16, x. 8, xi. 14 f., xiii. 4 ff., xv. 21, 33) contains any reason, which requires us to seek the here-mentioned Gilgal east of Jericho in the valley of Jordan. If, on the other hand also, they afford no stringent proofs of its identity with Jiljilia, yet this can admit of no doubt, when the existence of a town Gilgal east of Jericho is not demonstrable either from Joshua or Judges, and the district generally beyond the oasis on which Jericho lay, is a wilderness even to the Jordan, of which indeed Robinson states that in his journey from Jordan to Jerusalem he went only "a good half-hour through a desert tract" (Pal. ii. p. 509), but that onward to Jericho the whole tract might easily be cultivated, as the soil is loose and fertile, as that of Egypt, and needs only the superfluous waters from Jericho to render it extremely productive (p. 514), though it is not known that it ever had the superfluous waters from Jericho. "But where the water does not flow, the plain also produces nothing" (Rob. p. 531.) To this is added the geographical position of this point. Would Samuel, when he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel and Gilgal and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all these places (1 Sam. vii. 16), have chosen, besides Bethel and Mizpeh, a place situated in the south-east corner of Canaan, at all events on the border of the arable land, to meet a part of the nation for the settlement of their differences? to cause Saul to receive homage from the whole people as king? Or would Saul, as Thenius i. p. q. p. 147 supposes, have selected this corner for the head-quarters of his military operations against the Philistines encamped on the mountains at Michmash (1 Sam. xiii., xiv.)?—After all it is not to be wondered that Robinson, notwithstanding repeated examination of place and passage, found no trace of the remains of Gilgal east of Jericho, and could ascertain from none of the Arabs such a name in this district (Pal. ii. p. 532 f., 522.) We might wonder only at this, that he could mistake the identity of the site of Jiljilia with the Gilgal so often mentioned in the Old Testament, especially as it did not escape him that this name evidently corresponds to the old name Gilgal (iii. p. 299); but the wonder disappears when we recollect that all modern geographers have unhesitatingly assumed our Gilgal to be in the valley of Jordan, east of Jericho. See Rel., *Pal. ill.* p. 782 f. 811, Hamelsv. iii. p. 428 ff.

the still more remote Hermon, and towards the east the mountains of Gilead may be seen (comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 299 f.); and is also mentioned by Eusebius in the *Onom.* under the article *Γάλγαλα: καὶ ἄλλοις δὲ ἔοικεν εἶναι Γάλγαλα τὴν περὶ Βαιθάλ.* —The Bethel so celebrated in the Old Testament formerly named Luz, retired from the road leading directly from Jerusalem to Shechem (see v. Raum. Pal. p. 176 f.) Robins. (ii. p. 340 ff.) thought he had discovered in the ruins somewhat more than ten Roman miles distant from Jerusalem, which the Arabs call Burj Makhrun (برج مكحرون) or Burj Beitin (برج بيتين) (Beitin from Beitil, Beitel, as Jebril and Jebrin, from Gabriel.) On the other hand, Then. i. p. q. p. 127 ff., has proved by convincing reasons, that (1) this place, from its remoteness from Shiloh, could scarcely be paralleled with Lebonah (Lubban), as it is, Judg. xxi. 19; that (2) according to Jos. viii. 13, 14, in the immediate environs of Bethel and Ai, a tolerably large valley (הָעֲרָבָה, הָעֵמֶק) is found, but none of the vales at Makhrun can be called עמק, much less ערבה, as they are only נְחָלִים Wadys; that (3) here no higher mountains, but only hills are to be found in the neighbourhood, whereas, according to Jos. xvi. 1, 1 Sam. xiii. 2, Bethel lay either itself on a considerable eminence (הַר בֵּית אֵל) or such a height was found close by it; and that, lastly, (4) Makhrun itself, according to Robinson's own assertion (ii. 339), is enclosed on every side by heights, and from the highest point of the ruins existing there only four very contiguous places can be seen, whereas Lot from this district (his tent between Bethel and Ai, Gen. xiii. 3 f.) could overlook the whole plain of Jordan (the site of the subsequently arising Dead Sea), Gen. xiii. 10. All the indications given in the Old Testament of the situation of Bethel agree much more with the village Sinjil (سنجيل), lying southwest of Seilun (Shiloh), on the high bank of the deep Wady running west, at least 200 feet above its

Rosenm. Althk. ii. 2, p. 159 ff., v. Raum. Pal. p. 196 f., Ges. *thes.* i. 288 f., Winer R.W. i. p. 504 f. Most have distinguished from it only the Gilgal mentioned in Deut. xi. 30 and Jos. xii. 23 (Rel. *l.c.*, Hamelsv. iii. p. 250 ff., Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 128, v. Raum. p. 152, 197 not., Winer i. p. 505), whereas Gesen. *l.c.* will acknowledge only the supposed Gilgal in the valley of Jordan in all the passages of the Old Testament without exception.

bottom, comp. Rob. iii. p. 300; for this is as far from Seilun as Lubban; here is found an actual valley (עמק), "the broad fertile valley lying beneath (Sinjil), which expands towards the east into a beautiful basin-like valley of considerable size" (Rob. p. 300, 303), and also the mountain of Bethel, whether it be the ridge on which Sinjil itself lies, or, as Then. p. 130 assumes, "the mountain, on which Jiljilia lies, which rises very precipitously, and in the ascent of which Robinson and his companions riding on mules occupied half an hour" (iii. p. 289.) Lastly, the proximity, often indicated in the Old Testament (Gen. xii. 8; Jos. vii. 2, viii. 9, 12, 17, xii. 9), of Bethel and Ai lying east of it, is suitable; for Sinjil lies quite in the neighbourhood of Turmus Aya (ترمس عايا), in which Then. (p. 129 ff.) has rightly again discovered and demonstrated the Ai (הָעַי) conjectured to be there indeed by Rob. (ii. p. 300), but not recognised.

Vv. 3—7. In Bethel the scholars of the prophets come to Elisha with the intelligence: knowest thou, that Jehovah will take away thy master from thy head to-day. Elisha answers: I also know it, be silent; because he knew that Elijah from humility wished to keep his approaching glorification secret. The same is repeated when Elijah with his attendant arrives at Jericho (v. 5.) In both places Elijah again attempts to induce his minister to remain behind, but as in Gilgal, so also here, without success (vv. 4, 6.) They go therefore both farther to the Jordan, while fifty scholars of the prophets from Jericho follow him at a distance, and remain standing in sight of the Jordan, not merely *honoris causa* (Seb. Schm.), but to be eye witnesses of the miraculous removal of their great master (v. 7.) —The journey, which Elijah before his departure from this earth made from Gilgal through Bethel and Jericho, was not only dependent on this, but he must touch at these places on his way to the Jordan, but had evidently the same object, for which his ascent to heaven was revealed not merely to Elisha but also to the schools of the prophets at Bethel and Jericho. Elijah said indeed that the Lord sent him to Bethel, to Jericho, to the Jordan (vv. 2, 4, 6); he thus took this route under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, and wished before his departure to visit the

schools of the prophets which he had planted, perhaps to make some farther arrangements in them, to impart admonitions and instructions, as he might have often done, at all events by his presence to strengthen and confirm the scholars of the prophets in a life consecrated to the service of the Lord, without expecting that they were apprized by the Spirit of the Lord of his approaching departure from this life. But as his ascent to heaven took place less on his own account than on that of his surviving associates in office, God had revealed it to so many, in order that, by the miraculous glorification of their master, they might be still more determined than they had been even by his words, lessons, and admonitions, to continue in their calling without fear or trembling, when their great master with his mighty spiritual power was no longer at their side to instruct, advise, and protect them. But before all Elisha, whom the Lord had appointed as successor to him (1 Ki. xix. 16), must be prepared by the last passage of his master to be the prosecutor of his work. He therefore never leaves his side, and wishes, no doubt also from the inward impulse of the Holy Spirit, to be an eyewitness of his glorification in order to receive the spiritual inheritance of the firstborn from his departing spiritual father.—The phrase לָקַח מֵעַל רֹאשׁ, "to take from over the head," is not exactly equivalent with מֵאֵת or לָקַח מֵעִם (vv. 9, 10), and is explained not merely by this, that the scholars sat at the feet of their master (comp. Acts xxii. 3, and Vitringa, *de synag. vet.* p. 167 ff.) but contains an intimation of his removal by ascending into heaven, as ἐπαίρειν and ἀναλαμβάνειν Acts i. 9, 10.

Vv. 8—10. Arrived at the Jordan, Elijah takes his prophet's mantle, rolls it together, and smites the water with it, upon which it parts hither and thither, so that the two go over on dry ground. The mantle (אַדֶּרֶת), the external symbol of the prophetic office (comp. on i. 8), is the bearer of the invisibly operating Divine power of the Spirit, which inspired the prophet. The miracle is analogous to the miraculous dividing of the Red Sea by the rod of Moses stretched over it (Ex. xiv. 16, 21), but yet so peculiar and so perfectly corresponding to the *prophetic* character of Elijah, that mythical legend could never have devised it. Moses the leader of the people accomplishes his miracle by

his shepherd's rod, Elijah the prophet divides the water with his prophetic mantle. The ἅπαξ λεγ. גָּלַם all the ancient versions except the Arabic render by *convolvit*, from which גְּלוֹם, χλαμυς, the mantle, Ezek. xxvii. 24, comp. Hävern. on the passage. V. 9 f. On the farther bank Elijah grants to Elisha a last request before his departure, in the certain confidence that the Lord at his entreaty will bestow it upon him, and Elisha asks, "Let a double portion in thy spirit פִּי־שְׁנַיִם בְּרוּחֲךָ be to me (come upon me.") This request, of which Elijah says, "thou hast asked a hard thing," many interpreters from Ephraim Syr. and Theodoret to Köster and Krummacher (in his Elijah) have so misunderstood, as if Elisha had desired the doubled measure of the spirit of Elijah ("let thy spirit be double in me," Luther after the Vulg.), which then some refer to this, that Elisha performed much more and much greater miracles than Elijah (see Cler. on the passage, and Pfeiffer, *dub. vex.* p. 442 f.), others, as Köster i. p. q. p. 82, understand of the "gift of prophecy and miracle," or even, as Krummacher, of this, that the spirit of Elisha as an evangelical spirit was twice as great as the legal spirit of Elijah. But this sense neither lies in the words, nor follows from the answer of Elijah, nor can such a relation to Elijah be proved from the life and acts of Elisha. The expression פִּי שְׁנַיִם, properly a mouthful, a ration of two, derived from the custom of setting before the person, whom it is intended to honour, a twofold or even manifold portion, (comp. Gen. xliii. 34 and Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. i. p. 207) stands here and in Zech. xiii. 8, (comp. Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 342 ff.), in evident relation to Deut. xxi. 17, where it denotes the double portion, which the firstborn received in the inheritance of his father.[1] Resting on this law, according to which the firstborn is to receive from his father פִּי שְׁנַיִם בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא לוֹ as inheritance, Elisha asks for himself as his firstborn spiritual son the double portion in (of) his spirit, as his inheritance.[2] With this

[1] This dependence of our passage on Deut. xxi. 17, formerly perceived by S. Münster, Vatabl., Grot., Seb. Schm., Calm. and others, has again in our times received great prominence from Hertz i. p. q. p. 42, and Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 133 f.

[2] Elisha regards himself as firstborn son in relation to the other

agrees also the answer of Elijah: "thou hast asked a hard thing," says he, not because, as Calmet thinks, he had expected, "that Elisha would content himself with asking some portion of his garments or his moveables (!), or even of his authority or counsel for the government of the other prophets," but because the grant of this petition lay not in his own but in God's power only, on which account he connects its fulfilment with a condition depending not on his will but on the Divine disposal: "If thou see me, when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so" (v. 10.) According to his own inclination Elijah wished not to have Elisha standing so near him as an eyewitness of his departure from the earth, but from his constant refusal to leave him he saw that he could not escape from him. He therefore left it to the Lord, and made this Divine disposal a sign to Elisha, whether the Lord would grant his request or not. Moreover the request itself implies a spiritual dependence on the part of the petitioner, and on this account Elisha could not possibly desire that the double measure of the spirit of Elijah should be imparted to him. He that is departing cannot bequeath to his heir more than he himself has. Thus the activity of Elisha in comparison with that of Elijah appears to be subordinate. He stands and acts only as the prosecutor of the work done by Elijah, not only externally in relation to the idolaters, but internally in regard to the schools of the prophets. Elisha performed the anointing of Jehu and Hazael entrusted to Elijah, and thereby realizes the extirpation of the house of Ahab announced to him by Elijah; he only maintains and cherishes the schools of the prophets, which Elijah founded. And not Elisha but Elijah appears as the coryphæus of the prophets along with Moses the representative of the law, on the mount of the transfiguration of Christ (Mat. xvii. 4), conversing with the Lord who was come to complete the law and the prophets. (Mat. v. 17.) Only a quite external mode of viewing the greater number of the miracles performed by Elisha can discover in them a proof that double the spirit of

בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים, inasmuch as he was called by Elijah at the command of God to be his successor, not perhaps because he had been the scholar of Elijah longer than the other sons of the prophets educated by him.

Elijah rested upon him.—On the form לָקַח for מִלְקַח comp. Ew. Gr. § 351, and with regard to the sense comp. Gen. v. 24.

V. 11. While they talked with one another as they went on, "behold there (appears suddenly) a chariot of fire and horses of fire, which parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up in the tempest to heaven." The sense of this so often misinterpreted and rejected miracle[1] discernible by us is, God suddenly removed Elijah to heaven; he took him away to himself, as in former times Enoch, Gen. v. 24, from Elisha and from the earth (comp. vv. 9, 10.) The removal took place בַּסְּעָרָה in the tempest, as Luther has properly rendered it. סערה usually storm-wind, and often a figure of the Divine judgments (Is. xxix. 6, xl. 24, xli. 16), denotes the thunderstorm in which God displays his omnipotence in the most striking manner, and visibly manifests his presence on the earth. Thus Jehovah answers Job, xxxviii. 1, xl. 16, מִן הַסְּעָרָה and appears to Ezekiel, i. 4, in the רוּחַ סְעָרָה in a great cloud of fire in the midst of which he sat over the cherubim. In our passage the סערה is the thunderstorm, the tempest accompanied with an appearance of fire, that presents itself to the eye of Elisha as a chariot of fire and horses of fire, on which Elijah goes to heaven. The thunderstorm is the earthly substratum of the Theophany; the chariot of fire with the horses of fire the symbolic form, in which the removal of his master into heaven is presented to the view of the surviving Elisha. All other questions concerning the nature of the fiery chariot, the place from which Elijah was taken, the day of his ascension, which C. a Lap. assigns according to the Romish martyrology to twentieth July of the nineteenth year of Jehos-

[1] The exeget. Hdb. p. 9 on the passage enters into all conceivable natural explanations; that Elijah was struck with lightning, carried away by a hurricane, or a whirlwind, or a waterspout, or buried in the sand, or tossed into the valley or into the Jordan, or carried off in a chariot by the king's guards, or that he lost himself in a clond descending upon the mountain and was still alive; or that the narrative is only a vision that Elisha had in his sleep, during which Elijah left him. Not content, however, with this, it lastly brings forward the fables of heathen mythology concerning the miraculous removal of Hesperos, Tithonos, Ganymedes, Romulus, etc., 'in order to give the stamp of a myth to the narrative for which the rationalists have also declared themselves in the works quoted at 1 Ki. xvii.

haphat[1] and so on, into which the older expositors entered, are to be avoided[2] as unprofitable disquisitions about matters, which surpass the limits of our earthly thought and comprehension.—The ascent of Elijah is more frequently compared with that of Christ, and both are really alike in this respect, that Elijah as Christ left the earth, not in the way of earthly death, but in other respects they are doubtless to be distinguished. Elijah, as servant of the Lord, as minister of the law, who preached with his fiery zeal the fire of the anger of the Divine righteousness to the apostate generation of his time by word and deed, is removed to heaven by the Lord in the fiery tempest, the symbol of the judicial righteousness of God; Christ, as the Son, to whom all power in heaven and on earth was given, being transfigured by his resurrection into the imperishable Divine nature, returned by virtue of his eternal Godhead to the Father, was lifted up before the eyes of his disciples, and a cloud received him withdrawing his form from their view, Luk. xxiv. 51; Acts i. 9. The ascent of our prophet has also been placed side by side with the death of Moses; but Moses died, and was appointed on account of his sin to die in the wilderness (Deut. xxxii. 49 ff.), and was only buried by the Lord, so that no man saw his grave (Deut. xxxiv. 5 f.) God thus caused him to taste of death as the punishment of his sin, but withdrew him after death from the power of death (comp. Jude v. 9 and M. Baumgarten, theol. Comm. on the O. T. i. 2, p. 566.) Elijah did not die, but was, by a miraculous change (1 Cor. xv. 51 f., 1 Thes. iv. 15 ff.) taken up to heaven. This difference is

[1] The year of the ascent of our prophet cannot be ascertained, as v. 1 contains no date, although we may infer from the order of our section, that it took place not long after the death of Ahaziah of Israel.

[2] On this ground also we disclaim the wish with Br. Bauer (d. Relig. d. A.T. ii. p. 208), to understand philosophically the necessity of this miracle and to deduce from it, "that in Elijah the self-consciousness of the absolute Spirit was that which substantially operated." For this proposition, as well as its farther explication, "it was the Divine grace, which withdrew the zealot from his conflicts and preserved him in his kingdom as a security for the future removal of the opposition, and at the same time the process of the personality of Elijah, who in the pain of his vain wrestling, was directly impelled to see his task and his person that was bound up with it, secured, and had it secured in his removal"—rests on the pantheistic view of things, which does not unite but confound heaven and earth, God and the creature.

quite in keeping with the character of the two men of God. Moses, the lawgiver, goes in the way of the law, which works death as the wages of sin (Rom. vi. 23, vii. 13), from the earthly life. Elijah, the prophet, who is ordained for correction to future times (ὁ καταγραφεὶς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς εἰς καιρούς), to pacify the wrath before the judgment, to turn the heart of the father to the son, and to restore the tribes of Israel (Sir. 48, 10), is taken from this world to heaven as the forerunner of Christ (Mal. iii. 23 f., Matt. xi. 10 14) without tasting death, predicting the ascension of the Lord, who, by his resurrection from the dead taking the sting from death and the victory from hell (1 Cor. xv. 55) as the abolisher of the curse of sin and conqueror of death and the grave, ascends into heaven to the right hand of the Father on high.[1]

[1] If we hold these parallels between Moses, Elijah, and Christ, together with the import, as discussed on 1 Ki. xvii., of the personality and historical position of Elijah in the development of the kingdom of God; we can no longer reject his ascent to heaven as impossible or unique in its kind. For it does not stand alone, but has its hold and support in the ascension of our Lord, and is quite in harmony with the great mission, which was committed by the Lord to our prophet, who formed the middle point between Moses and Christ in the unfolding of the Divine preparations for salvation, which was in progress for so many centuries. Whoever, indeed, has not recognised this import, has not comprehended in general the spirit and essence of the Divine revelation, to him it not only is but must be incredible, as we find not only in the Jew Josephus, but also in the Christian Church father Ephraim Syrus. Josephus (Antiq. ix. 2, 2) is silent concerning the miracle, and only relates: Ἠλίας ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἠφανίσθη· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω μέχρις τῆς σήμερον αὐτοῦ τὴν τελευτήν, and even adds, that it is written in the sacred books of Elijah and of Enoch: ὅτι γεγόνασιν ἀφανεῖς· θάνατον δὲ αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς οἶδεν. The church-father Ephraim in his explanation of our chapter passes over the last words of v. 11: "so Elijah went up in the tempest to heaven," and paraphrases the remainder thus: "Suddenly there came from the height (ܪܘܡܐ) a storm of fire (ܥܠܥܠܐ ܕܢܘܪܐ), and in the midst of the flame the form of a chariot and horses, and parted them both asunder; the one of them it left on the earth, the other, namely Elijah, it carried to the height (ܠܥܠ ܠܡܪܘܡܐ); but whither the wind (or spirit? ܪܘܚܐ) carried him, or in what place it left him, the Scripture has not informed us, but it says, that after some years a terrifying letter from him full of menaces was delivered to king Jehoram of Judah." Hence we see clearly, we may infer that Ephraim did not believe the ascent of Elijah, but wisely avoided clearly expres-

Vv. 12, 13. When Elisha saw his master miraculously removed, he cries out: "My Father, my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" and in token of his grief rent his garment in two pieces, then took up the mantle of Elijah, which had fallen from him in his removal, and returned to the bank of the Jordan. He calls Elijah אָבִי אָבִי as his spiritual father, who begat him as his spiritual son by the word of the Lord. This deep inward conception of spiritual fatherhood, according to which the scholars of the prophets are called בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים sons of the prophets, is enfeebled by the paraphrase, *magister fidelissime* (Schulz, Maur.) רֶכֶב וּפָרָשִׁים war chariot and riders, on which the strength and stability of earthly kingdoms rest, are here an emblem of the mighty protection, which Elijah afforded to the kingdom of Israel by his spiritual acts, and hence the Chald. thus paraphrases רַבִּי רַבִּי דְטַב לְהוֹן לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בִּצְלוֹתֵיהּ

sing his opinion on the point. What Josephus and Ephraim did not venture to do, that was done in the last century by J. D. Michaelis, in his remarks on his translation of the Bible for the unlearned, when, on v. 1 of our chapter, he informs the unlearned, that Elijah did not go to heaven, but was only removed from Palestine, and lived at least twelve years longer,—to be able to write a letter to Jehoram king of Judah (2 Chr. xxi. 12), as the Syrian father Ephraim, so generally regarded as orthodox 1400 years ago thought, and even stated, "that no one receives letters from the people in heaven." That Ephr. Syr. perhaps thought this, though he has not expressed it, we perceive from his words quoted above. Those, therefore, who like Bauer (hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 167), the author of the exeget. Hdb. on the passage, and Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 183) have copied this notice from Mich., have not cast a glance at the orthodox church father. Moreover, I have, in my apolog. Vers. ü. d. Chr. p. 310 f. proved, that the statement, 2 Chr. xxi. 12 ff., may be reconciled with the ascension of Elijah; and if what is there said were not sufficient it is not necessary, on account of 2 Chr. xxi. 12 ff., either to deny the ascension of Elijah, or with Gramb. and Mov. to pronounce the passage in question unhistorical, as it does not speak of a letter (אִגֶּרֶת, as a letter is called in 2 Chr. xxx. 1, 6, or סְפָרִים), but of a writing (מִכְתָּב), which came (arrived) from Elijah to Jehoram. —On the other hand the narrative of the ascension of Elijah in connection with the prediction, Mal. iii. 23 f., has occasioned among the Rabbins, and even the Mohammedans (Arabs and Persians) a mass of legends and myths concerning our prophet, which Winer (R.W. i. p. 376), and still more fully Rödiger (Allg. Encyl. d. Wissensch. vol. 33, p. 324 f.) have enumerated, but in a very uncritical way connected with the biblical representations of Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah.

מַרְתִּיכָן פָּרָשָׁיו. Comp. xiv. 13.—The prophet's mantle of Elijah is in his removal transferred to his successor, as a pledge to himself of the granting of his request, and as a visible sign to others, that the spirit of Elijah rests upon him (v. 15), that he is appointed by God as his successor.

Vv. 14, 15. In order, on the one hand, to confirm Elisha himself in the conviction that his petition has been granted, and on the other to accredit him among the scholars of the prophets and the people as the successor of Elijah appointed by the Lord, the waters of the Jordan are again miraculously divided, when Elisha smites them with the mantle of Elijah and invokes the God of Elijah.—The question: Where is Jehovah the God of Elijah, even he? is an expression of the firm confidence, that the God of Elijah will be with him also, and by him prove himself as glorious as he did in and by Elijah. The אַף־הוּא belongs, notwithstanding the foregoing *Athnach*, to יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֵל as emphatic apposition, *even he.*[1] The object of this miracle is attained in the scholars of the prophets from Jericho, who had seen it from the other bank; on this they acknowledged that the spirit of Elijah rested on Elisha, and came to meet him, and did homage to him as now their spiritual father and master.

Vv. 16—18. Although it was revealed to the scholars of the prophets, that the Lord was about to take away Elijah, yet those at Jericho could not discover in this, that he was quite to disappear from the earth; for they had not witnessed his miraculous

[1] This אַף־הוּא caused much difficulty to the old interpreters. The LXX. regarded it as *nom. pr.* of God ἀφφώ, unless, as Schulze *ad Theodor. Op.* i. p. 516 conjectures, they had another text before them; the Masor. transfer it to the following sentence, and this construction occasioned as well the addition, in the *Vulg.* after the first *percussit aquas, et non sunt divisae*, which even Dathe still finds necessary, as also among the old expositors the opinion, that Elisha smote the waters twice, and the division took place only after the second smiting. The Masor. construction, according to which אַף הוּא is separated from the preceding words, yields no tolerable sense, as the various attempts at explanation in Pfeiff. *dub. vex.* p. 444, and Stark *l. c.* p. 181 f., show, and is the less binding, as the Chald. has not recognized it. The second וַיַּכֶּה is only a repetition of the first, and is to be rendered, "so he smote the waters, when," etc.

ascension, but only that, by the power of God, he had divided with his mantle the waters of the Jordan (v. 7 f.) They therefore request Elisha to allow them to send fifty stout men of themselves to search, and, when he is unwilling, urge him so long, that he permits them; but after three days' searching in vain they return with the firm conviction, that Elijah is no longer on earth.—The belief, that the Spirit of the Lord might have carried Elijah away and cast him on some mountain or valley, was awakened in the scholars of the prophets, not, as many interpreters think, by the fact that Elijah had often before suddenly disappeared,[1] but only by the circumstance that they could not imagine the possibility of a removal into heaven, and therefore could scarcely understand the revelation made to them (v. 5), on account of the indefiniteness of the phrase, לָקַח־מֵעַל רֹאשֶׁךָ, of a proper ascent to heaven, but only of a removal by death. If Elisha also related to them, how Elijah was taken from him,—and we may certainly presume that he did so,—yet they might still believe, that the Lord by his appearance in the tempest had only removed his servant from this life and taken his soul into heaven to himself, but his earthly tenement may have fallen somewhere on the earth, for which they wished to search, in order to do the last honours to their departed master.—פֶּן־נְשָׂאוֹ (v. 16) *ne forte abstulerit.* פֶּן with the *præter.* expresses the fear of an event having actually occurred, as it is conjectured, comp. Ew. § 599; according to the sense here, we feared that he had taken him.—The form הַגֵּיאוֹת is to be read according to the *Kethibh* הַגְּיָאוֹת, for which the Masor. substituted the usual plural form of this word הַגֵּאָיוֹת, comp. Ezek. vii. 16, xxxi. 12, xxxii. 5, and Ew. Gr. § 415.—V. 17. The form עַד־בֹּשׁ in v. 17, viii. 12, and Judg. iii. 25, means properly, until being ashamed, until feeling shame from the disappointment of his hope or expectation, and then until embarrassment, which is indeed only a consequence of the shame or disappointed expectation, whence lastly in the

[1] Comp. the remarks on 1 Ki. xviii. 12. In this case they would scarcely have thought of searching for him, as they must have known from former experience, that searching after him was vain, and that he would reappear of his own accord.

farther usage is developed and fixed the sense of *nimium* and of *justo diutius*.[1]

Vv. 19—24. The two following miracles also, with which Elisha begins his prophetic action, are designed to produce in the people respect for him as the man of God furnished with the Spirit and power of God, as Elijah.

Vv. 19—22. When the inhabitants of Jericho complain to him, that in the otherwise excellent situation of their town the water was unwholesome and the land caused untimely births,[2] Elisha puts salt in a new vessel and pours it into the spring with the words: "Thus saith the Lord, I have healed this water," etc., whereupon the water was healed. The injurious property and effect was not taken from the water by the salt poured in; for even if the salt actually possessed this power,[3] a whole spring, could not be corrected by a single dish of salt, even for one day,

[1] The objection, which Studer on Judg. iii. 25 and Redslob, "on the phrase עַד־בּוֹשׁ," in the theol. Stud. u. Krit. of the year 1837, part 4, p. 912 ff., has raised against the meaning above developed in accordance with Ges. (*thes.* i. 191), and Winer (*lex. s. v.*), namely, that in Judg. iii. 25 the waiting subjects must have been ashamed of having waited so long, in the other two passages, on the contrary, the shame must be conceived to be on the part of the object, that is, in our passage on the part of Elisha, who through the urgent petition was at last ashamed, so that he yielded to it, in viii. 12, on the part of Hazael, whom Elisha had embarrassed by the long fixedness of his gaze—this objection has little weight, because the different application of the formula only occurred after its import was long established. The new explanations of it attempted by the two learned men are, however, quite untenable. What Redsl. says of Studer's assumption of a double *radix* בּוֹשׁ, of which one signifies to redden, the other to be late, "how arbitrary," this holds still more of his own etymological combinations, by means of which he derives for בּוֹשׁ from the stem syllable בק, פץ, entangle, tatter, the meaning of irresolute tarrying, loitering, lingering, and thence a noun בּוֹשׁ in the sense, *a little while*.

[2] As travellers mention also of some other places without stating the proper cause, see Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 213 f.

[3] Thus *Fr. Spanheimius in Dub. evang.* p. iii., p. 457 says: *aquam putealem foetido vel pravo alio sapore imbutam sale corrigi*, without intending thereby to deny the miracle in our passage; for he regards the salt only as *causa secunda*, to which is added the word as *virtus extraordinaria prorsus causae primae, a qua pauco sale multis aquis salubritas et perpetua quidem restituta.* So also *Fr. Valesius, de s. philos.* cxxxiv. p. 246 f.

much less for a longer time or for ever, nor could a neighbouring spring, that supplied the head spring with too strong and therefore injuriously operating mineral water, be filled up or stopt, as J. D. Mich. asserts. The pouring in of the salt was a symbolic act with which Elisha accompanied the word of the Lord, by which alone the spring was healed.[1] Salt, on account of its power of preserving from putrescence and decay, is the symbol of incorruptibility and of life removing death, comp. Thol., Ausl. d. Bergpr. p. 118 and Bähr, Symbol. ii. p. 325 f. The choice also of the new dish belonged to the symbol; Elisha took it not *ob munditiem* (Seb. Schm.) or *ne vasis naturæ prodigium tribuatur* (Cler. and others) but as a symbol of purity and inviolateness.—V. 19. וְהָאָרֶץ מְשַׁכָּלֶת, "the land is causing untimely births. שִׁכֵּל *orbavit, abortum fecit, i.e., intulit,* comp. Gen. xxxi. 38, Ex. xxiii. 26. In v. 21 מְשַׁכָּלֶת is most simply regarded with Gesen. as a substantive, *abortatio,* as the supplement of הארץ, proposed by some, does not suit either the parallel מָוֶת or the words יִהְיֶה מִשָּׁם. Cler., Dathe, and Köster incorrectly render, "and the soil is barren;" for even in Mal. iii. 11 שִׁכֵּל does not mean, to be barren.

Vv. 23, 24. From Jericho Elisha proceeded to Bethel, the chief seat of the idolatrous worship (1 Ki. xii. 29), where likewise was a school of the prophets (v. 3.) When by the way little children out of the city mock him as a bald head,[2] he curses

[1] According to the statements of travellers, this well is still extant, and the several adjacent wells at Jericho, the waters of which spread of the plain, called by the Arabs Ain es Sultan (عين السلطان), thirty-five minutes distant north-west from the present village and castle, on a group of hills rising not far from the foot of the mountain *Quarantana* (Kuruntul قرنطل), formerly surrounded by a kind of reservoir or half round wall of hewn stone, that is now very dilapidated, from which the water is conveyed down in many directions to the plain. It is a large fine spring, with certainly not cold, but not warm water, of a pleasant and sweet (according to St. Schultz somewhat salt) taste. Comp. Pococke, Beschr. d. Morgenl. ii. p. 47, Steph. Schultz, Leit. d. Höchsten v. p. 85 and Rob. Pal. ii. p. 528 f.

[2] Most interpreters assume that the baldness in Elisha's head must have had its ground in a natural defect, as Elisha, according to xiii. 14 ff., lived more than fifty years after this date, and therefore could not

them in the name of the Lord, to avenge the honour of the Lord violated in his person. And two she bears come out of the wood, and tear forty-two of these children. קֵרֵחַ bald head, who is bald on the back of his head,—was reckoned an insult, Is. iii. 17, 24, as among the Romans, comp. *Sueton. vit. Caes.* C. 45, and *v. Domit.* C. 18. The priests were therefore forbidden to shave themselves bald (Lev. xxi. 5) because they should be blameless even in externals.[1] הִתְקַלֵּס בְּ properly to behave oneself as a crier, that is, mocker, hence to mock him crying aloud; for קִלֵּס is always connected with חֶרְפָּה or לַעַג, comp. Jer. xx. 8, Ps. xliv. 14, and Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 244 f. —בקע in *Kal* and *piel*, to split, cleave, then in *piel* also, to tear, lacerate, Hos. xiii. 8.—On mount Carmel see on 1 Ki. xviii. 19.

---

## CHAPTER III.

JEHORAM, KING OF ISRAEL, VV. 1—3. HIS EXPEDITION AGAINST THE MOABITES IN CONJUNCTION WITH JEHOSHAPHAT, VV. 4—27.

Vv. 1—3. The reign of Jehoram or Joram of Israel is distinguished from that of his father in this, that he removed the pillar of Baal, which Ahab had set up in Samaria, and raised the calf-worship to be again the predominant religion of the state; although the worship of Baal appears to have been still openly continued, (comp. x. 28 ff.), which is not to be wondered at, since his mother Jezebel, the founder of it in Israel, was living during his whole reign (ix. 30.)—On the beginning of his reign comp. the remarks on i. 17.—For the *Suff. Sing.* and מַמֵּבָה (v. 2) comp. Ew. Gr. § 568.

Vv. 4, 5. As introductory to the expedition related in the fol-

have been bald from age, and no trace of the tonsure is to be found among the Hebrew prophets.

[1] On the deeper ground of this prohibition connected with the idea of the priesthood, see Bähr's Symbol. ii. p. 184 f.

lowing verses, the revolt of the Moabites, mentioned i. 1, from their dependence on Israel is repeated in v. 4, and at the same it is stated, in what the tribute consisted, which the Moabitish vassal king Mesha paid to Israel, namely, in the wool of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams, which he paid no doubt yearly, and not, as Cler. with H. Ludolf is inclined to suppose, only on certain occasions, perhaps at the beginning of each new reign; as for a Moabite king, who had not only the best pastures in his own territory, but might range with his flocks over the adjoining wilderness of Arabia, this could scarcely have been too great an annual tribute. That tribute was in ancient times, and among Asiatic nations even to this day, is often paid in natural products and fruits of the earth, is a well-known fact.[1] נֹוקֵד shepherd, Am. i. 1, vii. 14, possessor of flocks, מָרֵי גִיתָא (Chald.), صَاحِبُ مَاشِيَةٍ (Arab).[2] נֹוקֵד more strictly denotes نَقَّاد *pastorem ovium* نَقَد *dictarum*, but نَقَد according to the statements of Arabian lexicographers collected by Bochart in the *hieroz*. i. p. 442 *genus ovium caprarumque deforme et pumilum et caetera vilissimum, sed pilis aut lanis mollibus, quaeque magni aestimantur.*—הֵשִׁיב *iterum iterumque attulit*, comp. Ges. *lex. s.v.*—אֵילִים צָמֶר means not woolly rams, as Ges. (Lehrg. p. 667) still explains with the ancient interpreters; צָמֶר is not at all dependent on אֵילִים, but a second object to הֵשִׁיב, by which the first object is more exactly defined; literally, he paid 100,000 lambs . . . as (by, in) wool; for which we say in English, the wool of 100,000 lambs, etc.

Vv. 6, 7. As Ahaziah during his short reign had done nothing for the reduction of Moab, Jehoram immediately at the begin-

[1] *Pecunia ipsa a pecore appellabatur. Etiam nunc in tabulis Censoriis pascua dicuntur omnia, ex quibus populus reditus habet, quia diu hoc solum vectigal fuerat. Mulctatio quoque non nisi ovium boumque impendio dicebatur. Plin. hist. nat.* xviii. *C.* 3.

[2] In the *Tanch. Hierosol.* נוקד is explained *possessor ovium, quales sunt nostro tempore Emiri Arabum et Emiri Turcomanorum, h. e. Arabum in Turcarum terris degentium, qui possident oves, quas pascunt ipsorum servi et pueri.* See Ges. *thes.* ii. 909.

ning of his reign hastened to retrieve the neglect, and not only numbered all Israel, in order to levy a considerable army from his own subjects, but invited Jehoshaphat to join him in the campaign; which the latter, although he was censured on account of his treaty with Ahab (see note on 1 Ki. xxii. 29), yet again (as 1 Ki. xxii. 4) readily promised and performed, probably in order on this occasion still more to chastise the Moabites for their invasion of Judah (2 Chr. xx.), and to serve his own interest, inasmuch as by their new subjugation under Israel they would be no longer in a position to recommence operations against Judah. בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא (v. 6) is only an approximate definition of time—in the beginning of the reign of Jehoram.

Vv. 8, 9. "And he (the king of Israel) said, which way shall we go up (against Moab)? And he (Jeshoshaphat) said, the way through the wilderness of Edom." They might march into the land of the Moabites in two ways, either above the Dead Sea over the Jordan, and then over the border stream Arnon entering from the north; or, proceeding round the south end of the Dead Sea, and pushing from the south through the northern part of the mountains of Edom. Although the latter way was longer and encumbered with greater difficulties and perils, because the army had to cross a very difficult mountain range; yet Jehoshaphat decided for it, perhaps partly because the Moabites, confiding in the difficulty of access on their southern border, might expect no attack in that quarter, and he might therefore hope to be able to fall upon them unsuspecting and unprepared, and overcome them; partly no doubt on account of the king of Edom, whom with his troops he might in this way take with him, and, though he should not add much to his own strength, thereby make sure of his troops, so that he could not, while Jehoshaphat was in the field against the Moabites, make any new attempt at revolt by a second invasion of the kingdom of Judah. Yet, however well concerted this plan might appear, the army of Israel, after it had made a circuit of seven days in the march through the deep rocky valley of Ahsy (الاحسي),[1]

[1] The usual way from the south of Judah to the land of Moab, which the crusaders and modern travellers have pursued, goes round the Dead Sea to the mouth of the Wady el Deraah (الذرعه) or Kerak,

separating the territories of Edom and Moab, was involved in the greatest danger from want of water for man and beast, as the Wady of this valley, where plenty of water, it was hoped, would be found, was now dry.[2]

Vv. 10—12. In this difficulty the hearts of the two kings are unveiled. Jehoram believes ruin to be inevitable, and, filled with despair, cries out, "Alas! that Jehovah has called these three kings to deliver them into the hand of Moab." Jehoshaphat has confidence in the Lord, and asks, if there be no prophet, at whom they may enquire the word of the Lord, that is, may seek a Divine revelation concerning the present emergency, whereupon a servant of the king of Israel answers, that Elisha, the minister of Elijah, was at hand. The phrase פֹּה אֱלִישָׁע, "here is Elisha," implies, that Elisha, if not in the camp, was yet in the immediate neighbourhood. That he was not in the camp itself may be inferred from the statement, "they (the three kings) went down to him" (v. 12.) At all events the prophet, under the impulse of the Divine Spirit, had come into the neighbourhood of the army, because the embarrassment of the kings was to be a means in the hand of the Lord, not only of gaining

and then along this up to Kerak (كرك), comp. Rob. iii. p. 756 f., ii. p. 466. But the confederate kings did not take this way, but marched through Wady el Kurahy (القراحي), emptying into the south end of the Dead Sea, and forming a "fruitful slope of the Moabitish table land" (Ritter, Erdk. ii. p. 372), or es Safieh (الصافيه) farther into the mountains towards Wady el Ahsy, erroneously called Wady el Hössn by Seetzen (Rob. iii. p. 31)—a deep glen, which Burckhardt (Reise ii. p. 673) passed with the greatest difficulty. That they advanced in this way we must conclude from the fact that, when the water failed, they were (v. 21) still on the border of the territory of Moab, which is formed indeed by this Wady (comp. Burckh. ii. p. 674, and Rob. iii. p. 107), and that the water arrived from Edom (v. 20.) Both circumstances are unsuitable to the Wady el Kerak.

[2] According to Robinson, indeed (iii. p. 16, 31) this Wady should have a never-failing stream, to which the Ghor owes a stripe of green. But if this stream be distinguished from other mountain torrents by being filled with water, not merely during the rainy season; yet seasons of drought may occur, when it becomes dry. At least Robinson has not proved the contrary. Robinson holds this Wady also to be the brook Zered, mentioned Deut. ii. 13, 14, 18; Num. xxi. 12 (Pal. iii. p. 107 f.)

more respect for the prophet from Jehoram, but also of guiding Jehoram himself to the Lord as the only true God. Humbled by misfortune, the three kings proceed in person to Elisha, instead of summoning him before them. By the description of Elisha, as one "who poured water on the hands of Elijah," that is, was his servant, he is certainly distinguished as a genuine prophet, from whom a true revelation of God might be received.

Vv. 13, 14. In order to humble still more the king of Israel, already bowed down by the pressing necessity, and to produce a salutary fruit of repentance in his heart, Elisha addresses him in the stern words: "What have I to do with thee! go to the (Baal) prophets of thy father and thy mother," who may now help thee, and when Jehoram beseechingly answers: אַל, *not*, that is, speak not so, refuse me not, entreat for us the help of the Lord, for the Lord has led not me alone, but the other two kings also into this misfortune, and he alone can deliver us from it, he declares with a solemn asservation, that only out of respect to Jehoshaphat, the true servant of the Lord, does he deign to look on him. ראה פל and הִבִּיט אֶל to see, look at one, that is, to think him worthy of a look, to render aid to him.

Vv. 15—19. Thereupon Elisha calls for a minstrel in order to gather in his thoughts by the soft tones of music from the impression of the outer world, and by repressing the life of self and of the world to be transferred into the state of internal vision,[1] by which his Spirit would be prepared to receive the Divine revelation. "When the minstrel played the hand of the Lord came upon him." On יַד יְהוָֹה comp. 1 Ki. xviii. 48.—וְהָיְתָה (v. 15) stands according to later usage for וַיְהִי, comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 48, 2 Sam. xv. 5, and Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 553, hebr. Gr. §.

[1] Comp. Passavant, unters. üb. d. Lebensmagnetism. p. 207, ed. 2. —If any one wish for examples of the powerful influence of music, abundantly known by experience, in calming and elevating the mind, let him consult Bochart's *hieroz.* i. p. 461 ff., and Cler. on 1 Sam. xvi. 16. The object, for which Elisha calls for the minstrel, is, moreover, often erroneously determined; thus, by some Rabbins, in order to soothe the grief of Elisha for the departure of Elijah; by many others, for example, by Herder also, to appease his anger against Jehoram; by J. D. Mich. and others, "to find in the sound of the harp the answer of God," or, as Knobel expresses himself, "to deliver his admonitory address in the proper strain!"

615. V. 16 f. Upon this he commands, in the name of the Lord, to make a multitude of pits (גֵּבִים גֵּבִים) in the valley, for without wind or rain being seen, it would be so abundantly supplied with water, that they and their flocks (מִקְנֶה animals intended for slaughter) and their beasts (בְּהֵמָה beasts of burden) might drink. The army are to dig pits in the wady—to collect the water, which would otherwise flow away. For the abundance of water came, as may be perceived from the connexion, in this way, that far from the Israelitish camp in the eastern mountains of Edom a great fall of rain, a kind of cloud-burst took place by which the wady was at once filled, without the Israelites having seen the wind, which in the East always rises before rain (comp. Harm. Beob. i. p. 51 f.), or the rain itself.—On the *infin. absol.* עָשֹׂה comp. Ew. Gr. § 583.—V. 18 f. "But," continues Elisha, "this is a light thing for the Lord; he will also deliver Moab into your hand. And ye shall smite every fenced and choice city, fell all the good trees (fruit trees), stop all wells of water, and mar every good field with stones."[1] תַּכְאִבוּ many consider a Syriasm for תַּכְבִּיבוּ, *perdetis*, from כָּבַב *nocuit*, comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 374, and Winer in *Lex. p. v.;* but here the Hebrew usage suffices, כָּאַב *doluit*, in *hiph. dolore affecit* —to inflict pain on the field, that is, to render it unfruitful by sowing it with stones."

Vv. 20—25. The word of the Lord spoken by Elisha was very soon fulfilled. The next morning, at the time when the morning offering was presented in the temple at Jerusalem, and his people by sacrifice and prayer in his legal sanctuary were entreating his

[1] This description of the wasting of a land refers to the law Deut. xx. 19 f., according to which, in the besieging of the Canaanitish towns, which were designed for the possession of the Israelites, the fruit trees should be spared, comp. Hertz. i. p. q. p. 44, Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 135. This law is to have no application to the land of Moab, because Moab was to be treated no better than the hereditary foe of Israel in case of war. For the hewing down of the fruit trees is to this day practised in war by the Arabs (comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 217), and other barbarities no less, as even the Romans sometimes, in order to cut off water from the enemy, filled up the wells with sand, (comp. Mich. Mos. R. i., § 64, p. 79 f.), and the French even now in Algiers take vengeance on their enemies by burning the crops.

mercy,[1] there came water from Edom and filled the country; by which not only was aid given to the Israelitish host in their extremity, but destruction prepared for the Moabites. For on the intelligence of the advance of the allied kings, they had summoned all that were able to bear arms, and posted themselves on the border (v. 21.) At sunrise they see in the neighbourhood of the camp of Israel the water coloured red as blood, and taking it for blood, imagine that the allied kings had quarrelled and their armies had been mutually destroyed. In this belief they set out to take the spoil, but meet the Israelites, when they came to their camp, prepared for battle, and, as they were not provided for such an event, are smitten, so that they are obliged to make their escape (vv. 22—24.) The Divine aid by which the army of Israel was not only saved from destruction, but even obtained a complete victory over their enemies, consisted here not in a miracle of God surpassing the known laws of nature, but only in this, that God the Lord, as he had announced before by his prophet, introduced the laws of nature working to the determinate end in the predetermined way. As the suddenly appearing mass of waters was effected in a natural way by a violent rain in the distance, so also the illusion, that was so fatal to the Moabites, is explained in a natural way, indicated even in the text. From the red earth of the pits the water collected in them had assumed a red colour, which was considerably increased by the rays of the rising sun falling upon it (comp. הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ זָרְחָה עַל־הַמָּיִם v. 22), so that, seen from a distance, it must have appeared like blood. But the Moabites might be the less disposed to think of an optical illusion, as by their familiar acquaintance with the region, they knew that the wady had at that time no water, and they had seen or learned nothing of the rain which had fallen far from them in the Edomite mountains (comp. מַיִם בָּאִים מִדֶּרֶךְ אֱדוֹם v. 20.) Thus it was natural to think that the water was blood, and the blood could only proceed from the

[1] In the mention of the presenting of the meat-offering (comp. Ex. xxix. 38) as in the reference to the evening sacrifice (1 Ki. xviii. 22), lies an allusion to the law of Moses (comp. Hengstenb. i. p. q.), but at the sametime an indirect rebuke of the revolt of the ten tribes from the lawful worship at Jerusalem.

enemies having perpetrated a great slaughter of one another, especially as the jealousy between Israel and Judah was no secret to them; it was undoubted that Edom, after the recently attempted but unsuccessful revolt, accompanied them only as an unwilling confederate; and, lastly, the recollection of their latest expedition against Judah in conjunction with the Edomites and Ammonites—how this was frustrated by the mutual destruction of their own army, comp. 2 Chr. xx. and my apolog. Vers. p. 241 ff.—could not yet be effaced from their memory. But if they came upon the host of Israel under such a delusion, the battle could only end for them in a defeat and general flight. But Israel marched after the fugitives into their own land[1] and wasted it, as the prophet had predicted (v. 24 f.) עַד־הִשְׁאִיר וגו׳ "until they left the stones thereof in Kir-haraseth." On the form הִשְׁאִיר comp. Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 649 not. and Maur. on Lev. xiii. 44.—The *suff.* in אֲבָנֶיהָ refers either to the land of Moab or to the following קִיר חֲרָשֶׂת. Kir-haraseth (here and Is. xvi. 7), otherwise קִיר חֶרֶשׂ, *arx lateritia* (Is. xvi. 11; Jer. xlviii. 31—36) is without doubt (as is generally assumed) identical with קִיר מוֹאָב castle of Moab, כְּרַכָּא דְמוֹאָב (Chald.), Is. xv. 1, and was the most important, perhaps the only fortress of the land, built on a high and steep calcareous rock, from which might be seen the Dead Sea and even Jerusalem, surrounded by a deep and narrow glen, which thence descends westward under the name of Wady Kerak to the Dead Sea. The place is still extant under the name Kerak, with a strong castle, which, built by the knights of the cross, played an important part in the history of the crusades under the name *Crac*, and has been visited and described in recent times by Seetzen, Burckh., and others. Comp. Rosemn. Althk. iii. p. 58 ff., v. Raum. Pal. p. 263 f., Ges. comm. on Is. xv. 1, and *thes.* iii. 1210; Rob. ii.

[1] וַיַּכּוּ is to be regarded according to the *Kethibh* וַיָּבוֹ for וַיָּבוֹא (see on 1 Ki. xii. 12): "and Israel came into the land and smote Moab," comp. *L. de Dieu, crit. s. ad h. l.*—The *Keri* וַיַּכּוּ has been rightly rejected by Dathe and Maurer.—וְהַכּוֹת is the *infin. constr.*, which in a negligent style stands for the *infin. abs*, see Ew. Krit. Gr. 565 and hebr. Gr. § 616.

p. 466, iii. p. 124.—This fortress the allied kings besieged; the slingers surrounded it and did it much damage (וַיַּכּוּהָ.)

Vv. 25—27. When the king of Moab saw that the battle was too strong for him, he attempted, with seven hundred men with drawn swords, to break through the besiegers (לְהַבְקִיעַ properly, to cleave them) to the king of Edom, that is, on the quarter occupied by the king of Edom, probably because he expected least opposition from him. But the attempt failed, when he in despair offered his first born son,[1] not to the God of Israel (Eph., Syr., Grot.), but to his idol Chemosh (comp. 1 Ki. xi. 7) on the wall, and therefore in sight of the besiegers.[2] וַיְהִי קֶצֶף וגו׳ "and there was great indignation against Israel." Many understand these words so that by the abomination of a human sacrifice the heart of the pious Jehoshaphat, and perhaps also of the Idumæan king, was so moved and provoked with the Israelites, who had without mercy driven the besieged to an extremity and forced them to this abomination, that they retired and compelled the Israelites to do the same. Others think, that even the Israelites themselves were so excited to indignation by this abomination, that the allies with one accord raised the siege (Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. 353, Schulz, Dathe, and others.) But as the phrase היה קצף על, in all other places where it occurs (for example Num. i. 53, xviii. 5; Jos. ix. 20, xxii. 20; 2 Chr. xix. 10, xxiv. 18, etc.), is only used of the Divine anger and judgment, which is incurred by sin, we must not conceive it to be otherwise here. The sense is, by this deed of horror, to which the allied host drove the king of Moab, a heavy Divine judgment came upon Israel, that is, the besiegers feared the anger of God, which they

[1] Schulz erroneously assumes with several Rabb., that בְּנוֹ means not his own son but that of the king of Edom. For Am. ii. 1 obviously refers to another occurrence though unknown to us.

[2] The heathen in great calamities very often endeavoured to propitiate their gods by human sacrifices. Thus for example Eusebius (*præp. evang.* iv. 16) gives the following statement from Philo's Phœnician history: Ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι. Comp. with this E. v. Lasaulx, die Suhnopfer d. Griech. Röm. (Würzb. 1851) p. 8 ff. and 11.

had incurred by giving occasion to the human sacrifice so strictly forbidden in the law (Lev. xviii. 21 and xx. 3), and desisted from the siege without taking the castle or subjugating Moab again to Israel, wherein the anger of God against them was manifested. Only the latter point is put forward in the text, while the former or subjective side of the question is omitted.

---

## CHAPTERS IV. —VIII.

### MIRACULOUS WORKS OF ELISHA.

From chap. iv. to viii. 6, follows a series of miraculous works of Elisha, all of which fall in the reign of Jehoram king of Israel, but are arranged not strictly in chronological order, but still in a certain order of nature. The union of the natural order with the chronological, according to which the chronological arrangement has been partly sacrificed to the natural connexion, and partly the natural resemblance to the succession of time,[1] is obvious, because *(a)* several of these narratives are not attached by the form of connexion proper to Hebrew historiography, for events succeeding each other (comp. iv. 1, 38, 42, v. 1, vi. 8—24 and viii. 1); *(b)* the miracles performed in favour of the scholars of the prophets and of private individuals are first related (iv.—vi. 7), and afterwards follows the action of our prophet bearing upon the political destinies of the people and the king as their leader (vi. ff.); and *(c)* not only in several sections is that, which is con-

[1] The cause of this peculiar phenomenon is, that the strict adherence to the chronological point of view prevailing in our books would have necessarily led to a dismemberment of the homogeneous matter which would have been detrimental to the general impression; to which it may be added, that the author of our books did not find stated in his sources the time at which each particular miracle occurred. The arrangement of the historical materials here followed moreover quite resembles that of the predictions in the greater prophets, where in Isaiah the chronological and natural principle are similarly combined with one another, but in Jeremiah the natural order and again in Ezekiel the chronological point of view predominates; comp. Hävern. Einl. ii. 2 p. 63 ff., 206 ff., 263 f.

nected in reality, but separated in time by a number of years, brought together, for example the promise given to the Shunammite, of a child, and the resurrection of this child in his youth, and likewise the miracles in the wars with the Syrians, but also it is evident that some of these events, which happened earlier, are recorded later than others. Thus the section viii. 1—6, coming in regard to time at all events before ch. v., is from the nature of the case placed at the end of the miracles which Elisha wrought for king Jehoram, because the salutary fruit and effect of these acts is most conspicuously displayed in it. On the contrary, from regard to chronology the four miracles wrought in favour of the scholars of the prophets are partly at least separated from one another, comp. iv. 1—7, 38—41, 42—44, and vii. 1—7. For that the interposed narratives actually intervene according to time, may be perceived from this, that not only v. 8 ff., but also vi. 1 ff. are attached to the foregoing by *Vav rel. hist.* Lastly, to the union of both principles the story of Naaman the leper owes its place in ch. v., which falls in the order of nature after vi. 7, since the series of miracles wrought for and on private individuals, closes with it, and the miracle itself is performed upon a foreigner, and thus the fame of the prophet already extended to foreign countries; in the order of time it must have stood either between vv. 23 and 24 of ch. vi., because the invasions of the Syrian forces, to which vi. 8—23 refer, preceded it, or else at the close of ch. vii. Regarded as a whole, however, the section iv. 1—viii. 6, has its right chronological place; for the history in ch. iii. falls at an earlier, and that in viii. 7, at a later period.

If now we consider the contents of our section, we perceive from the testimonies here given of the proceedings of Elisha, what a blessed fruit the zeal of Elijah for the Lord of Sabaoth had borne, in the first place in the position of our prophet to the idolatrous son of the superstitious Ahab, compared with that which Elijah had to Ahab and Ahaziah. For it was undoubtedly the fruit of the activity of Elijah, that Jehoram caused the worship of Baal no longer to continue as the religion of the state, and had in general an ear more accessible to the words and deeds of Elisha than his two predecessors on the throne, although he did not decide with his whole heart for the Lord his God, on which account also the curse pronounced upon the house of Ahab

was at length fulfilled upon him. A still nobler fruit of the activity of Elijah appears in the schools of the prophets, with which we meet repeatedly in these chapters. Already had inspired companies of prophets gathered around Samuel, who dwelt in his neighbourhood at Gibeah and Ramah (1 Sam. x. 5—20, xix. 19 ff.), and under his protection and guidance, dedicated themselves to the service of the Lord for the revival of the theocratic feeling, that had declined among the people of Israel, occupied themselves with prophetic addresses and sacred music, and assembled for their common exercises at Ramah in a place called נָיוֹת, interpreted in the Chald. בית אולפנא and perhaps also lived together there, 1 Sam xix. 18 f., 22 f., xx. 1. These societies, arising solely from a common object of life and vocation, and not constituted by external rules, are usually identified altogether with the similar institutes of Elijah and Elisha.[1] But opposed to this is the circumstance, that the members of the societies of prophets originated under Samuel are never called בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים, as those under the guidance of Elijah and Elisha are uniformly designated (comp. 1 Ki. xx. 35; 2 Ki. ii. 3, 5, 7, 15, iv. 1, 38, vi. 1, ix. 1.)[2] Should not this peculiar designation lead to this, that the בני הנביאים stood in a much more intimate relation to Elijah and Elisha as their spiritual fathers than that, in which the חֶבֶל הַנְּבִיאִים and לַהֲקַת הנ׳ stood to Samuel as their superior (נִצָּב עֲלֵיהֶם, 1 Sam. xx. 20)? This conjecture is confirmed, if we look to the object of these societies and their position towards the people. Definite statements concerning the peculiar nature of the so-called schools of the prophets are indeed wanting in the O. T., and hence they have been sometimes compared with monasteries,[3] sometimes with the fraternity of the

[1] Thus by Vitringa, *de synag. vet.* B. i. P. 2. C. 7, H. Wits. *Miscell. ss.* i. B. i. C. 9, Buddeus, *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 222 ff., and 510 ff., and in the other works and treatises quoted by Winer R.W. ii. p. 335, and de Wette Archaeol. § 268, p. 383.

[2] On this distinction hitherto quite overlooked, Havern. also Einl. ii. 2, p. 20, has briefly remarked.

[3] Comp. *Hieron. epist.* 4 *ad Rustic. monach.* c. 7 : *Filii prophetarum, quos monachos in V. T. legimus, aedificabant sibi casulas prope fluenta Jordanis, et turbis urbium relictis, polenta et herbis agrestibus victitabant.* Comp. also *ep.* 13 *ad Paulin.* c. 5 : *Noster (monachorum) princeps Helias, noster Heliseus, nostri duces filii prophetarum, etc.*

Pythagoreans,[1] but in both cases incorrectly. The object and time of monachism stand in direct opposition to the call and agency of the prophets and their societies; the comparison of them with the Pythagoreans implies a total misconception of the prophetic office.[2] The societies of prophets did not wish to retire into solitude from the bustle of the world, in order to lead a contemplative life of sanctity in quiet sequestration from earthly life and business, as the monks of the ancient church, but were associations for mental and religious training in order to exert a powerful influence on their contemporaries, roused and called into life by the prophetic gifts of chosen instruments of the Lord, as Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha, whom the Lord had miraculously called and furnished with an extraordinary measure of his spirit in order to call back apostate generations "to the law and to the testimony." Societies which pursue this purpose of life, will, so long as they do not lose sight of it, only withdraw from the external world so far as its opposes them with hostility and persecution. If we compare in this respect the times of Samuel with those of Elijah and Elisha, the position of the prophet to the people in the latter was much more stern and hostile than in the former. Samuel stood at the head of the theocracy, as judge, ordering and conducting its political administration; as prophet he had, also, indeed, to combat idolatry, but he found the people bowed down by long and hard oppression under the heavy yoke of the Philistines, a susceptible and fruitful soil for the sowing of the word of God which had become precious when he appeared (1 Sam. iii. 1), and soon earned for himself, by the victory gained over the Philistines through his prayer (1 Sam. vii.), the confidence of the nation, which must have contributed

[1] So Tennemann, Gesch. d. Philos. i. p. 92 ff., Meiners, Gesch. d. Wissensch. p. 391 ff., Winer and de Wette in p. q.

[2] Especially the view of the Kanto-friesian deism and rationalism, that the prophets were only moral teachers and censors of the people, who watched over the observance of the Mosaic law, and especially developed more fully its moral parts and attached still more that was moral to it, than Moses himself could have contemplated" (see Stäudlin, Gesch. d. Sittenl. Jesu, i. p. 207 f.), or, as de Wette (Arch. p. 382) expresses himself, "the purifiers of the doctrines of religion and morals, the state sages and naturalists or miracle-workers" among the Hebrews.

much to the success of his administration, the change of the hearts of the people, and their conversion to the God of their fathers. Elijah and Elisha, on the contrary, stood over against a superstitious royal dynasty and a people seduced by the priests of the calves and the prophets of Baal, who required in the first place to be humbled by severe judgments and constrained to acknowledge the Lord and his prophets. Exposed in this conflict to constant persecution on the part of the servants of Baal, those who were gained by their announcement of the word of the Lord to the prophetic office were obliged, on account of their personal safety, to withdraw themselves much more from a hostile world, to combine much more closely together and attach themselves to their spiritual fathers, in order to arm themselves for the battle in defence of the honour of the Lord. To this was added the peculiarity, mentioned on 1 Ki. xvii., in the position of these prophets, that they were to furnish the people with a substitute for the want of the Levitical priesthood, for which purpose likewise a more permanent organization of the societies of prophets was requisite. We cannot therefore transfer the notices of our chapters concerning the life and institutions of the schools of the prophets at once to those societies under Samuel,[1] still less can we, presupposing a historical connection between them, assume that the schools of the prophets had continued uninterrupted from Samuel to Elisha. There was certainly no cessation of prophets during this whole period, but schools of the prophets are nowhere mentioned in the interval between Samuel and Elijah, certainly only on the ground that Samuel had given no fixed external constitution to his societies in order to secure their stability. As Samuel had fulfilled the commission given to him by the Lord in the foundation of a purely theocratic kingdom in the person of David; the societies of prophets called into existence by him might be dissolved at his death, as David, by the revival, not to say the creation, of a sacred psalmody, by a new organization of the priesthood instituted by Moses on Sinai for the intercourse of the people with God, and the revival of the Levitical worship thereby effected,

[1] As was generally done till the time of Thenius (d. BB. Sam. erkl. p. 79.)

as a man after God's own heart not only did all that could be done on the part of man for the production and perpetuation of a purely theocratic spirit among the people, but also actually introduced a new epoch into the life of the theocracy.—We have to regard Elijah therefore not merely as the restorer, but the proper founder of our schools of the prophets. Moved by the power of the Spirit of God animating him, believing souls were drawn to him, and then trained by him to be servants of the Lord, organs of his Spirit, and bearers of the theocratic life.[1] In accordance with the character of prophecy, these societies scarcely had a fixed external organization and institution of life according to prescribed rules, but were combined into a firm unity internally by the common object of their office, externally by the hostile opposition of the people who had fallen away from their Lord and God, and attached themselves to Baal, so that we find them at the time of Elijah's ascension in numerous communities at Gilgal, Bethel and Jericho, which Elisha took under his guidance and special protection. At first they had probably no common abodes, at all events as long as the rage of the wicked Jezebel wished to extirpate all the prophets of the Lord, and Elijah himself was obliged to be concealed, and escape out of the country. Only under Joram in Elisha's time do we find them dwelling in common buildings with a common board, (iv. 38 ff., vi. 1 ff.), and even then not all, but probably only

[1] Predicting or foreseeing future events certainly could not be taught, because this was a gift, which the Holy Spirit imparted according to his free will to whom he would; and therefore no doubt only the smallest number of the scholars of the prophets were endowed with this gift. But the imparting of this gift did not take place in an arbitrary manner, but presupposed on the part of the receiver not only a mental state suited to it, but also a fundamental knowledge of the law, and of the earlier manifestations of God, in which the schools of the prophets might be prepared. Although therefore nothing is related in the Old Testament of the points of instruction in these schools, yet it may be assumed in general, and indeed with full right, that the study of the law, and of its historical realization in the past development of the theocracy, formed the main point of instruction, to which were added the occupations of sacred poetry and music, which were inseparable. Music, however, was in no case cultivated merely in order that the scholars of the prophets might afterwards avail themselves of it in their discourses, as Winer (R.W. ii. p. 335) assumes, but as the most appropriate means to elevate the soul to God.

the unmarried and younger, while the married had their own houses (comp. iv. 1 ff.)

---

## CHAPTER IV.

ELISHA MIRACULOUSLY MULTIPLIES THE WIDOW'S OIL, VV. 1—7, PROMISES THE SHUNAMMITE A SON, AND RAISES THE CHILD FROM THE DEAD, VV. 8—37, MAKES NOXIOUS FOOD WHOLESOME, VV. 38—41, AND FEEDS MANY WITH A LITTLE, VV. 42—44.

Vv. 1—7. A poor widow of a scholar of the prophets complains to Elisha of her distress, that a creditor is about to take her two sons for bondmen. The law of Moses gave the creditor the right to claim the person and the children of the debtor, who could not pay, that they should be compelled to serve him as bondmen till the year of jubilee, when they should again become free, comp. Lev. xxv. 39, and Mich. Mos. R. iii. § 148, 4.[1] When the prophet learned from her, that she had nothing in her house but a cruet of oil (אָסוּךְ שָׁמֶן), he directs her to borrow of her neighbours empty vessels (not a few), then to shut herself in with her children, to pour oil from her cruet into the borrowed vessels and fill them, and then to sell this oil and therewith pay her debt, and keep the remainder for the support of herself and her children.—The widow does according to the word of Elisha, and the oil in her cruet is so wonderfully blessed, that it only ceases to flow when all the vessels she was able to muster were completely filled. She was to shut the door of her house (v. 4), in order not to be disturbed in her business by unnecessary spectators, and at the same time to avoid all unnecessary display of the miracle.—The form מיצקת I hold with Gesen. to be the *piel* מְיַצֶּקֶת, because this intensive form is here very suitable. If Maur. on the contrary objects, that the *piel* of this verb does not

[1] The complaint of this widow shows, therefore, that even in the kingdom of Israel the law of Moses was the foundation of civil rights. See Hertz i. p. q. p. 44 f., Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 135 f.

elsewhere occur, the form of the *hiph.* הוֹצִיק assumed by him is also nowhere found, but only הִצִּיק, comp. Jos. vii. 23, 2 Sam. xv. 24.—וַיַּעֲמֹד הַשֶּׁ׳, "the oil stayed," that is, ceased to flow. *L. de Dieu* is justly offended with וְאַתְּ בָּנַיִכְי as such an asyndeton is unusually harsh, and proposes to change וְאַתְּ into וְאֵת; "and live with thy children of the rest," whereby all harshness is removed.[1]

Vv. 8—16. On a journey to Carmel, Elisha came to Shunem in the plain of Esdraelon (see above p. 4) where a wealthy woman (אִשָּׁה גְּדוֹלָה) constrained him to eat with her, whereupon he, as often as he came this way, called on her. הַיּוֹם (vv. 8, 11, 19) the day, that time, then; comp. Ew. Gr. § 533. —הֶחֱזִיק בְּ to lay hold on, here in a figurative sense, to compel to remain. On סוּר see at 1 Ki. xx. 39.—V. 9 f. Hereupon this woman spoke to her husband, that he might build for this holy man of God an upper chamber and supply it with the necessary furniture, that he might at all times turn in thither. עֲלִיַּת־קִיר Cler. improbably explains *cœnaculum non pariete ligneo, sed muro structum*; Dathe, *conclave in muro*. The best is that of Ges. in his *thes.* iii. 1210, *conclave ad parietem s. latus domus* "a balcony attached to the side of the house." This balcony or upper chamber was erected "either on one of the back corners of the building or on the interior court-yard," see Faber, Arch i. p. 441.

[1] The forms אַתְּי for אַתְּ (vv. 16, 23, and viii. 1) and the suffixes ־ֵיכִי, ־ָכִי (vv. 2, 3, 7), regarded etymologically, are more ancient than the abbreviated forms אַתְּ and ־ֵךְ, ־ָךְ in ordinary use, but are mostly found only in later writings and called Syriasms, because they are the usual forms in the Syriac dialect, which preserved most tenaciously the etymological forms in the orthography. Comp. Ges. Lehrgeb. p. 216, Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 177, 372, Heb. Gr. § 302, 2.—To infer from these two forms with Eichhorn (Einl. iii. p. 554), Bertholdt (Einl. iii. p. 956), and Meyer (in Amm. u. Berth's Krit. Journ. iv. p. 245), that here a passage of his own has been inserted by an author, who had otherwise no part in these books, is untenable for this reason, that this narrative entirely corresponds in matter with the rest, and the form אַתְּי occurs also in 1 Ki. xiv. 2, and the corresponding suffixes are to be met with elsewhere either singly, as Jer. xi. 15, or collectively, as Ps. ciii. 3, 4, 5, cxvi. 7, 19.

—V. 11 ff. As Elisha lodged in the עֲלִיָּה prepared for him, he wished to prove himself grateful for the friendship shown to him by his hostess, and called her to him by his servant Gehazi and addressed her: "Thou hast taken all this care for us (חָרַד חֲרָדָה *sollicitam curam gessit*, Winer in *lex.*) what can I do for thee? Dost thou require to speak with the king or the captain of the host?" that is, hast thou any concern with them, that I could make interest with them for thee. She answered, "I dwell among mine own people," that is, I live quietly and peaceably among my neighbours, so that I do not need thy interest for me with the king or the grandees of his kingdom. *Ἀπραγμοσύνῃ χαίρω, καὶ εἰρηνικῶς διάγω καὶ πρός τινα ἔχειν ἀμφισβήτησιν οὐκ ἀνέχομαι.* Theod.—V. 14 ff. When Elisha conferred farther with Gehazi on the matter, the latter said to him, "But the woman has no son and is already old," whereupon he called her again, and informed her, "About this time next year thou shalt embrace a son." To estimate the great favour which this announcement implied, we are to consider not merely the natural longing of a mother after children, but at the same time the circumstance that barrenness and childlessness were regarded by the Israelites as a disgrace (Gen. xxx. 23; 1 Sam. i. 6 f.; Luk. i. 25) which a pious maternal heart must have felt the more acutely, as the Lord had promised in his word to the godfearing along with other blessings, the fruit of the body also as a special blessing for the true fulfilment of his commandments, Deut vii. 13 f., xxviii. 3, xxx. 9, comp. Ps. cxxviii. 3 f. כָּעֵת חַיָּה, "when the time revives," that is in the following year.[1] The expression

[1] On this expression see the discussion between Fritzsche and Tholuck in Tholuck's Beitr. z. Spracherkl. d. N. T. p. 68 ff. The rendering of כעת חיה "*sub tempus vivens, i.e. praesens,*" still maintained by Fritzsche (see his *Comm. in ep. ad Rom. C.* 9, 9), offends, as Thol. has rightly shown, (1) against the rules of grammar, as חיה, which has not the article, cannot be joined as an adjective with כָּעֵת, which is defined by the article, contains (2) a pure tautology with the foregoing לַמּוֹעֵד הַזֶּה, and (3) the assertion *sub tempus praesens* or "about this time if it is living = present" (as M. Baumgarten says on Gen. xviii. 9) is equivalent to "about this time after a year or next year about this time," a quite arbitrary *quid pro quo.*

is taken from Gen. xviii. 10, 15; comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 136. The Shunammite is to partake of this grace of God, which Sarah experienced in old age, that she may know that the God of Abraham still rules in and over Israel. אַל־תְּכַזֵּב, that is, raise no deceitful hopes in thy handmaid, comp. v. 28.

Vv. 17—25. Incredible though this announcement appeared to the Shunammite, as formerly to Sarah (Gen. xviii. 12 f.), yet it came to be fulfilled.—On v. 17, comp. Gen. xxi. 2. But her faith was soon to be tried and confirmed by a still more glorious manifestation of the omnipotence of the Lord working through his prophet. When the child given to her by God was grown to be a lad, he once complained in the field with the reapers of a violent headache, saying to his father, "My head, my head!" and when brought home to his mother, died at noon on her knees (vv. 18—20.) Although the disease of the child is no farther defined, yet expositors can scarcely be wrong in supposing that he died of inflammation of the brain produced by a stroke of the sun, as the sun-stroke during the hot season has brought violent fever on many travellers in those countries, comp. Cleric. *ad. h. l.* and Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 221.—Without mentioning to her husband the death of the child, the believing Shunammite (v. 21 ff.) brings the body into the chamber prepared for Elisha, lays it on his bed, requests her husband to send an ass with a lad to lead and drive it, on which she should ride (as is still customary in the East, see Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 222), and hastens to the man of God on Carmel, not once intimating the object of her journey to her enquiring husband, in order to lose no time nor allow herself to be diverted from her purpose by his possible objections, or to waver in her confidence in the wonder-working power of the prophet. From the words: "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day, as it is neither new moon nor Sabbath" (v. 23) Theod., Kimchi, C. a Lap., Vatabl., Grot., Cler., and others, have rightly inferred, that the pious in Israel on these days, which, according to the law (Num. xviii. 11 ff., Lev. xxiii. 3), should have been religiously observed, were accustomed to assemble in order to be edified by the prophets, from which Hertz i. p. q. p. 45, and Hengstenb. i. p. q. have farther concluded, that in the kingdom of Israel not only were the Sabbaths and new moons observed, as appears also from Am. viii. 5, but

the prophets here provided the pious with a substitute for the want of the Levetical priesthood.[1]—V. 23. שָׁלוֹם—וַתֹּאמֶר שָׁלוֹם here scarcely means *à Dieu*, but has the sense, "it is all well." The word usual in reply to the question concerning the welfare of any one (see v. 26) seems, as Cler. has remarked, to have been also employed, when it was intended to give no definite answer to the question and yet to satisfy the enquirer.

Vv. 25—32. When Elisha saw the Shunammite coming at a distance (מִנֶּגֶד properly, from the opposite quarter, that is, here *eminus*, from a distance, comp. ii. 7—15), he sent his servant Gehazi to meet her to enquire after the welfare of herself, her husband, and her child. She answers, שָׁלוֹם, because she wished to speak immediately with the prophet, to open the grief of her heart only to him, goes to the prophet and embraces his knees, in order to entreat the help of the "holy man of God" (v. 9.) Gehazi wishes to hinder her—*quod videretur inverecunda importunitas, prophetam hac ratione urgere et quasi cogere velle.* Seb. Schm. But the prophet says: "Let her alone; for her soul is vexed within her; and the Lord hath hid it from me, and hath not told me" (v. 27.)[2] The pious woman now complains to the prophet (v. 28), "Did I desire a son of the Lord?—thou didst promise him to me of thine own accord." "Did I not say, Do not deceive me (v. 16)?" that is, Did I wish lightly to put faith in thy word, that such a thing is now befallen me? What has befallen her she never mentions, which is psychologically explained at once by her great grief; but the prophet was able to discover it of himself from what was said. He therefore commands his servant Gehazi (v. 29 ff.) to take his staff, to go with it directly to Shunem and to lay it upon the face of the child; but the staff laid on wrought no miracle: "there was no voice, no hearing,"

[1] The words, "it is neither new moon nor Sabbath," are quite perversely explained by Harmar (Beobacht. iii. p. 381 of the German transl.) thus, "It is not the usual time either for a secular journey, which is willingly commenced with the new moon, or for a sacred one."

[2] Older theologians, Sanct., Seb. Schm., Calm. concluded from this, that the *donum prophetiae* was not a *habitus*, but a *virtus transiens*; but it only follows, that the supernatural revelation of every event did not belong to the *donum prophetiae*.

that is, the dead gave no sign of life. This is the meaning of אֵין קוֹל וְאֵין קָשֶׁב here as in 1 Ki. xviii. 29. Why does the prophet send his servant Gehazi to lay his staff upon the dead? And why did he command him to greet no one by the way and to return no greeting? The two questions are connected, for the prohibition to greet any one, must refer to the object of his mission. The answer given by most interpreters to the second question, *ne moras necteret*,[1] is obviously unsatisfactory, though the remark is also correct, that the Orientals lose much time in tedious greetings, (comp. Niebuhr, Beschr. v. Arab. p. 48, Winer R.W. i. p. 597 f.) More to the purpose are the remarks of C. a Lap., *ut G. vitaret omnem oculorum auriumque distractionem totumque se disponeret per preces ad tanti miraculi patrationem*, and of Theod., *ᾔδει αὐτὸν φιλότιμον καὶ κενόδοξον, καὶ ὅτι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐντυγχάνουσι τοῦ δρόμου τὴν αἰτίαν ἐρεῖ. ἡ δὲ κενοδοξία τὴν θαυματουργίαν κωλύει.* Only we must connect therewith the farther view of Elisha, to cut off antecedently by this prohibition the evasion that in the case of the fruitlessness of Gehazi's mission the failure of his attempt at resuscitation might be ascribed to an external accident. For he sent Gehazi with his staff, not in the hope that he would actually perform the miracle, but to give a practical proof to the Shunammite and her family, perhaps also to Gehazi himself, that the power to work a miracle did not lie magically in himself or in his staff, that on the other hand it could be accomplished only as a mark of Divine omnipotence through faith and prayer. This expedient, therefore, was prompted not by the design to exalt his own person at the expense of another, to display himself as the only wonder-worker, or to advance his own reputation (Köster i. p. q. p. 87), but only by regard to the believers, who relied on him, whose faith was to be purified from erroneous notions, turned from confidence in the human person of the prophet and directed only to God the Lord; and the resuscitation attempted by Gehazi failed neither *propter fidem ipsi a muliere non adhibitam* (Seb. Schm.) nor on account of the *κενοδοξία* of Gehazi, but in order to summon the confessors of the

[1] Olshausen finds this reason also unsatisfactory in the similar precept given by Christ to his disciples, Luke x. 4, and suiting neither the preceding nor the following context, and therefore wishes to ascribe to *ἀσπάζεσθαι* the kindred idea of seeking for favour.

Lord in Israel to true faith in the Lord. The pious woman, indeed, appears to have placed little confidence from the first in the expedient adopted by Elisha; for she solemnly assures him, that she will not leave him (v .30); but it is still a question, whether this urging of the prophet to come and help her himself arose from a doubt of the miraculous power granted to the prophet, or whether it was not rather the natural expression of her excessive grief and ardent desire to see her beloved child restored to life. The latter may be inferred from the compliance of the prophet with her request. But in that case every miracle should serve not only for the glorifying of God in the person for whom it is wrought, but in general for the recognition of the glory of the God of Israel among all believers.

Vv. 32—37. The raising of the dead child[1] by Elisha is certainly analogous to that accomplished by Elijah (1 Ki. xvii. 20 ff.), but the way and manner in which it is effected by Elisha still differs considerably from the former.[2] While the former took place immediately after Elijah had stretched himself three times on the dead child, the resuscitation here takes place step by step. After Elisha had prayed and bowed himself down (on גָּהַר comp. on 1 Ki. xviii. 42) the first time on the body and applied his mouth, eyes, and hands to the mouth, eyes, and hands of the child, the flesh of the child becomes warm. *Ingressa est anima in corpus pueri et cœpit calefacere corpus sine tamen actibus vitalibus.* Seb. Schm. On this he goes hither and thither in the chamber once, perhaps *ut ambulando excitaret tum majorem calorem, quem puero deinde incumbendo aspiraret, tum majorem fervorem orandi pro pueri resuscitatione* (Schm.), and

[1] Though it is distinctly stated in the text, that the child was actually dead (vv. 20, 31, 32), yet according to the opinion of the rationalist expositors he must have been only in a deep faint or a kind of apoplexy, and only apparently dead, and Elisha must have recalled him to life by some medical operations not particularly described (see Eichhorn, allg. Biblioth. iv. p. 246, Meyer, Hermeneut. d. A.T. ii. p. 264.) According to Passavant (Unters ü. d. Lebensmagn. p. 204 f.) and Ennemoser (d. Magnetism. p. 442), Elisha restored, him by magnetic manipulations, and Gehazi was unable (according to Passav.) to do this, because he and the mother of the child had an antipathy to each other. But no dead person has yet been restored by animal magnetism.

[2] And this very difference directly shows, that double the measure of the spirit of Elijah was not imparted to Elisha.

again bows himself over the child, when he sneezes (וַיְזוֹרֵר see Ges. *thes.* i. 435) seven times and opens his eyes—*secuti sunt uctus vitales sternutatio, apertio oculorum.* Seb. Schm. This sneezing was the first act of recovered respiration.

V. 38—41. At Gilgal during a famine (see on viii. 1 f.) Elisha makes an unsavoury and poisonous repast, savoury and harmless for the scholars of the prophets, by pouring meal into the pot in which it was cooked. V. 38. יֹשְׁבִים לְפָנָיו means not, they lived with him in common, but they sate before him hearing his instruction, comp. vi. 1.—שְׁפֹת corresponds as a *term. techn.* to our put on, of the placing of a pot on the fire, comp. Ezek. xxiv. 3, and Hävern. on the passage.—V. 39. The difficult אֹרֹת most explain, *olera*, so also the Chald. יַרְוֹקִין. The LXX. retain the Hebrew word, only somewhat distorted, *ἀριώθ*, on which Theod. remarks, that others explained it *ἄγρια λάχανα.* The Syr. and Arab. give it by ܚܠܒܝܬܐ, خُبَّيْزا, that is, mallows, a plant much eaten by the poor; the Talmud. גרגיר, that is جرجير, *eruca*, rocket, a kind of cabbage, of which Casaub. *ad Athen.* p. 248 says: *Erucae olim inter tenuiorum lautitias, aliquando etiam inter beatorum mensas admissae.* See *Celsii hierob.* i. p. 459 ff. and Gesen. *thes.* i. 56. The context speaks most for the general meaning *olera.*—גֶּפֶן שָׂדֶה denotes not the wild vine (*vitis lubrusca, ἄμπελος ἀγρία*), but "wild runners," as Luther has well rendered it, a running plant similar to the wild vine. What? This may be known from the fruits, which the scholar of the prophets gathered from it. פַּקֻּעֹת LXX. *τολυπὴ ἀγρία*, that is, according to Suidas, *colocynthis.* So the Vulg.; the Chald. u. Syr. have retained the same word, but the Arab., after the Syr., renders حنظل *colcynthis.* Ephraim Syr., however, mentions three explanations, *a.*, ܩܪܘܣܛܠܐ *cucurbitae parvae*, *b.*, ܒܥܐ ܡܪܝܪ *ova amara, i.e., colocynthides*, *c.* ܩܛܐ ܕܚܡܪ *cucumis asininus.* Of these three explanations only the latter two can be taken into account. Coloquintida and wild cucumbers have some resemblance to the leaves and tendrils of the wild vine, and their fruits also are alike. *Celsius (hierob.* i. p. 393 ff.), Rosenm. (Althk. iv. 1, p. 126 ff.), Winer (R.W. i. 525), and Gesen. (*thes.*

ii. 1122) have decided for the wild cucumbers, an egg-shaped fruit of very bitter taste, which, when it is ripe, on the slightest touch, burst with a crack and squirts out sap and seed-grains, while this property particularly suits the *rad.* פקע to split, in the Chald. and Syr. *fissus, ruptus est.* But this property, in my opinion, is directly opposed to this explanation. For how could the scholar of the prophets have brought home uninjured in his garment fruits that burst on the slightest touch, and shred them into the pot without becoming suspicious of their being eatable? I prefer, therefore, with Mich. (*suppl. ad lexx. hebr.* p. 344 f.) and Oedmann (verm. Samml. aus d. Naturk. iv. p. 88) the explanation of the old versions. The coloquintida also belong to the family of cucumbers, run along the ground and form round yellow fruits of the size of a large orange, which are extremely bitter, abstergent, causing colic and affecting the nerves.[1] The extremely bitter taste of this fruit alarmed the scholars of the prophets in partaking of this mess, so that they cry out, "there is death in the pot." Eaten in any quantity these fruits might actually cause death, comp. Dioscor. iv. 175 (178.) The ו before קְחוּ קֶמַח is not redundant, but presumes a thought suppressed in speech, perhaps, they are right not to eat of it, and (but) bring meal. That the meal cast in could not remove the bitterness, even the exeg. Handb. admits, but at the same time adds: "he may have added something else." By such arbitrary additions we may certainly explain anything naturally. Elisha also took away from the food not only its bitter but its noxious quality (observe the phrase דָּבָר רָע.) The meal as natural and wholesome nutriment of man was the symbol employed by Elisha to give the scholars of the prophets the soothing assurance that the food was deprived of its pernicious tendency.

Vv. 42—44. By the word of the Lord, as Elisha announced, twenty barley loaves and some ground corn, sent as first fruits to the prophet, are so blessed that a hundred men eat of it and there is something left. In this feeding, blessed by the word of the Lord, we have a faint type of the multitudes miraculously fed by

[1] Even *Celsius* i. *c. p.* 403 concedes: *nec diffiteor, quasdam in colocynthidem convenire notas* τῶν pakkyoth, *ut amarorem, virulentiam et externam faciem viti utcunque respondentem.*

Christ (Mat. xiv. 16 ff., xv. 36 f.; Mark viii. 8; Luk. ix. 7; Joh. vi. 11 f.); though it is not to be overlooked, that Elisha did not perform, but only predict this miracle, and therefore does not appear as a type of the Lord. The object also with which this brief narrative is given to us, is not to record one more miracle of Elisha,[1] but to show that the Lord cared for his servants, as he provided for them that which he had promised in the law to the Levitical priests. For, according to Deut. xviii. 4 f.; Num. xviii. 13, the first fruits of corn, must, and oil, as well as the cakes baked of the first of the new corn, were to be given to them, comp. Mich. Mos. R. iv. § 193. This record also affords a new evidence, that the pious in Israel did not acknowledge the priests of the calves instituted by Jeroboam as lawful; comp. 1 Ki. xi. 31, and Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 136 f.—Baal-shalisha is a place in the land of Shalisha (שָׁלִישָׁה, 1 Sam. ix. 4) situated, according to Euseb. and Hieron., fifteen Roman miles north of Diospolis in the region of Timnah, west of the chief ridge of Mount Ephraim. According to Thenius' not improbable conjecture, this district had received its name שָׁלִישָׁה, *three-land*, from the circumstance that here three different wadys run into one, the wady Kurawa (قراوا), (see Käuffer's Stud. ii. p. 142.) The place was accordingly not far to the west of Gilgal and Bethel. The word כַּרְמֶל, occurring besides here only in Lev. ii. 14, xxiii. 14, and taken thence, the Rabb. explain, "tender and fresh ears;" without any etymological grounds, comp. Mich. *Suppl. ad. lexx. h.* p. 1355 f., where also the different explanations of the old translators are to be found. כרמל is here, and Lev. xxiii. 14, according to the just remark of Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 713) an abbreviated expression for גֶּרֶשׂ כַּרְמֶל, that is, *contusum s. polenta* (*ἄλφιτον*) *frumenti praecocis et horni*, "fresh wheaten or barley groats." The assumption, however, that כרמל properly signifies *fruges hortensis easque praecociores et nobiliores* is very uncertain. See the particulars in Ges. *l. c.*—On the ἅπαξ

[1] On the whole the collective miracles of this chapter are not designed to awaken respect for the prophet, but to ground the scholars of the prophets and the pious in Israel in fidelity towards the Lord and in the steadfast faith, that the God of their fathers would not leave nor forsake any who trusted in him, but, as in former times, so now also would be nigh to all the faithful with his almighty aid.

λεγ. צִקְלֹן *saccus, pera,* comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 11,184 and Win. *lex. s. v.*

---

## CHAPTER V.

### HEALING OF THE SYRIAN LEPER NAAMAN, V. 1—19, AND PUNISHMENT OF GEHAZI WITH LEPROSY, V. 20—27.

V. 1. Naaman, the captain of the host of the king of Syria, a valiant warrior and highly esteemed by his king, because by him the Lord had given deliverance (תְּשׁוּעָה, not merely victory, but prosperity of every kind, in which no doubt victory was included), for the Syrians was afflicted with the leprosy (מְצֹרָע.) On the leprosy and its different kinds see Winer R.W. i. p. 131 ff., and the lit. there quoted.—נְשֻׂא פָנִים, one to whose appearance respect is paid, that is, the illustrious, Is. iii. 3, ix. 14; Job. xxii. 8. No ellipsis of ו occurs before מצרע, but the sentence is to be conceived thus: "and the man was as a warrior leprous." Here we are directed to the difference of views concerning the leprosy among the Israelites and the Syrians. While in Israel the leprous were by law excluded from human society, because the leprosy was regarded as the bodily type of sin (comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 594), in Syria a person affected with the leprosy was invested with a high state office in the court of the king.[1]

Vv. 2, 3. The attention of Naaman is drawn by a maiden of Israel, taken captive in an incursion of the Syrians, who was in the service of his wife, to the prophet in Samaria (Elisha) as the man, who could recover him of his leprosy. וַתְּהִי לִפְנֵי, she served היה לפני = עמד לפני, on which comp. p. 3.—V. 3. אַחֲלֵי here and Ps. cxix. 5, is a particle of wishing: "O that" probably to be regarded like אַשְׁרֵי, as originally a substantive (Kimchi), from the *rad.* חלה, comp. Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 501 and

[1] There is here also an indirect reference to the law of Moses, which becomes still more evident in the sequel of the narrative, and has been noticed by Hertz i. p. q. p. 46, and Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 137.

Ges. *thes.* i. 69. On the contrary, Fürst regards it (Concord p. 28), as a compound of אָח and לִי, analogous to לוּלֵי. The peculiar phrase אָסַף מִצָּרַעַת *recepit a lepra*, heal of the leprosy, is explained by Num. xii. 14 f., where נֶאֱסַף is used of the re admission of Miriam, who was excluded from the camp on account of the leprosy. As this readmission took place only after being healed of the leprosy, אָסַף was transferred to the healing itself. In v. 11 it is construed quite in this sense with *accus. pers.* Other explanations see in *L. de Dieu ad h. l.*

Vv. 4, 5. As soon as Naaman communicates this intelligence to his sovereign, he is provided with a letter to the king of Israel and travels to Samaria, carrying with him rich presents. Ten talents of silver = (26180 Pr. rixd.) £3421. 6000 shekels of gold amount, according to Mich., to 8824 ducats, according to Eisenschmidt, 24474; but it is quite uncertain, as the relative value of gold and silver at that time is unknown.—"Ten holiday suits," חֲלִיפוֹת בְּגָדִים, changes of garments, εἵματα ἐξημοιβά (Odyss. viii. 249), χιτῶνες ἐπημοιβοί (Od. xiv. 514), are costly state-dresses, which were worn on festal occasions, where the Orientals are still very fond of the change of garments (Nieb. Ruse i. p. 182), see Hamar ii. p. 112, iii. p. 447 and Winer R. W. i. p. 782. These presents designed for the prophet on healing him were extremely valuable; but Naaman, as captain of the Syrian army and favourite of his sovereign, was not a poor man, and the malady, of which he expected to be healed, was such as no physician in his own land was able to cure.

Vv. 6, 7. When, on the arrival of Naaman, the king of Israel (Jehoram) received the letter of the Syrian king, and read that he requested him to heal Naaman, he rent his garments in alarm, and exclaimed, "Am I a god, that can kill and make alive." Never thinking in his unbelief of the prophet Elisha, Jehoram sees in the desire of the Syrian king only an occasion for a new war, hence his alarm. וְעַתָּה and now (here and x. 2) is explained by this, that the whole contents of the letter are not communicated, but only the passage of it relating to the present matter, comp. Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 655 not. The terms of the letter, "I send to thee . . . . . that thou mayest heal him," were not so

insolent in meaning as Jehoram imagined.[1] וַאֲסַפְתּוֹ has only the meaning, cause him to be healed, as thou hast a wonder-working prophet.—The words "Am I a god to kill and make alive," are a description of the Divine omnipotence, see Deut. xxxii. 39, 1 Sam. ii. 6, and not to be referred with Grotius to this, that leprosy is *velut mors cutis*. מִתְאַנֶּה from אָנָה أَنَّى *tempus fuit, appropinquavit tempori suo*, in *kal* unused, in *piel*; *obvenit, occidere fecit* to cause to come or happen, occasion, Ex. xxi. 13, in *hithp.* to cause something to come, to seek an occasion, hence תֹּאֲנָה occasion, Judg. xiv. 4.

Vv. 8—14. After Elisha heard the affair, he rebukes the king for his unbelieving conduct, and directs Naaman to come to him, "That he may know that there is a prophet in Israel." When Naaman with his train (horses and chariots), stood before the house of the prophet, he says, by a messenger sent out to him: "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh will return to thee and thou wilt be whole." Naaman had expected that the prophet would come out to him, a man so high in rank, and perform the cure by solemn invocation of his God with sundry manipulations, and is therefore so provoked at this treatment, that he turns round and goes away in anger, because he thinks his native streams, the rivers of Damascus, much better than all the waters in Israel. But his servants represent to him that he might still try this easy cure, as he would certainly have done something much greater (more difficult) at the word of the prophet; and, as soon as he had dipped himself in the Jordan seven times, according to the word of Elisha, his leprosy is removed,

[1] The old expositors found in these words partly insolence, partly ignorance. *Insolentia—dum imperat regi Israelis, ignorantia—dum putat in potestate regis esse, imperare prophetae ut sanet Naemanum.* But as the Syrian king had actually no evil design, but only wished the cure of his highly esteemed general, we are not to interpret his words too harshly. Ignorance of the nature and office of the prophets they certainly betray, but this is not to be made of much account in a heathen king, whose priests and γόητες were quite at his service. That he does not mention the prophet in his letter is explained partly from the fact, that it is merely a letter of recommendation, to which Naaman himself was to add the necessary explanation, and partly from his having presumed that so celebrated a prophet would be universally known.

"his flesh came again (as fresh and whole) as the flesh of a little child." The reason why Elisha did not come out to Naaman is neither to be sought with Ephr. Syr., Theod., and Procop. Gaz. in the Mosaic law, which prohibited intercourse with lepers; the law, indeed, prescribed the inspection of the lepers by the priests, for which purpose they must come near them, nor with C. a Lap. in the intention to magnify the miracle in the eyes of Naaman, but discovers itself in the expressions of Naaman concerning this conduct. Naaman was strongly built up in the haughtiness inherent in every natural man by his high civic position, in which all beneath his master and sovereign bowed before him, and served him most reverently, and was to receive a salutary humbling, and at the same time to learn that he owed his cure not to a magical touch of the prophet, but only to the power of the Lord working through his word.[1]—V. 10. וְיָשֹׁב בְּשָׂרְךָ, "thy flesh will return," that is, become sound. In the perfect white leprosy, of which we are involuntarily led to think here (comp. v. 27), the flesh is dissolved and consumed by scabs, ulcers, and raw flesh, until at length the patients often die suddenly in consumption combined with dropsy, comp. Winer (R.W. i. p. 132 f.), so that the cure may be rightly described as a restoring of the flesh. V. 11. הֵנִיף יָד to wave the hand, that is, here, to move it hither and thither over the deceased part, to stroke it. V. 12. Abana and Pharpar are rivers of Damascus. The Abana (אֲבָנָה probably identical with אֲמָנָה, by commutation of the labials ב and מ, as the *Keri* has it), coming from the hill Amana (Song. iv. 8) a peak of Antilibanus, is generally taken for the *Χρυσοῤ-ῥόας* or *Βαρδίνης* (Steph. Byz.), now called Barady (بردى) the cold stream, which divides into five branches, and flows through Damascus; see O. v. Richter, Wallfahrten, p. 155 f. The Pharpar (פַּרְפַּר *celer* from فرفر *festinavit)* must be a small stream descending also from Antilibanus, that unites its clear and trans-

[1] *Naeman superbus est sua mundana dignitate, qua apud regem Syriae pollebat, putatque prophetam hunc ipsi debere honorem exhibere, ut ipse ad eum egrediatur; imaginatur, si utique propheta aliquid possit, id tamen debere fieri per contactum manus, quasi virtus singularis in manu prophetae residere debeat, quod cum non fieret, indignabatur quasi non recte fieret, conatur tandem istam imaginationem defendere argumento a ratione petito, quod aqua Jordanis esset impotens.* Seb. Schm.

parent waters with the Barady, and is now called Fyjeh (الفيجة), comp. فاج iv. *festinavit.* These determinations are, however, not quite certain, as the statements concerning the names of the Barady and its tributaries in different places are not quite consistent, comp. Ges. on Burckhardt's Reise i. p. 488, *thes.* i. 116, and ii. 1132, Winer, R.W. i. p. 60, and ii. p. 293. As the water of Fyjeh is "the purest and most transparent that can be found, and is very wholesome, indeed this stream improves the water of the Barady, which is considered unwholesome," (O. v. Richter p. 157), we can easily conceive, that Naaman esteemed his native rivers better than the water of Jordan, which is usually troubled, "of a clay colour," (Robins. Pal. ii. p. 496), lukewarm rather than cold, but still drinkable, comp. Rosenm. Althk. ii. 1, p. 201, and Winer R.W. i. p. 708.—אָבִי (v. 13) is a confiding and respectful form of address, as in vi. 21. The sentence דָּבָר גָּדוֹל וגו׳ is to be joined as condition with the following, "If the prophet had told thee (bid thee do) some great thing, wouldst thou not have done it?" Comp. Ew. krit. Gr. p. 662. Heb. Gr. § 626. וְאַף כִּי "how much rather then (comp. Ew. § 622), when he has said to thee." V. 14. "He dipped himself seven times in Jordan." This Elisha had required, because the cure was to be performed on the basis of the covenant of Jehovah with Israel. Seven is the signature of the covenant, see Bähr, Symb. i. p. 193.

V. 15—19. After Naaman was cleansed of his leprosy, he returns to Elisha, confesses before him his belief that there is no God in all the earth but in Israel, and offers the prophet a gift in token of his gratitude. But when the latter, to remove all appearance of selfishness, by which the false prophets were wholly actuated, steadfastly refused to receive the present, Naaman begs for permission to take two mules' burden of earth, that he may be able to worship Jehovah thereon in his native land; for he will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice to any other god, but only to Jehovah; but may Jehovah pardon him in this, that when on account of his office he must accompany his king into the temple of Rimmon, he bows down with him before Rimmon. In this confession of Naaman we have the

Divine object in his cure. The bodily help given was to be for him the way to deliverance from his spiritual misery, the means of leading him to the knowledge of the true of God, and to faith in him. In this also he goes so far as to promise, that he will worship no other God but the Lord; but his knowledge remains still confused with polytheistic superstition. He wishes to take earth from the land of Israel, to sacrifice upon it to the God of Israel, because he is still bewildered with the misconception, that Jehovah, as the heathen believed of their gods, can be truly and acceptably worshipped only in his own land, or if not there, yet on an altar erected of the earth of his own land. But because his knowledge is still obscured by superstition, he cannot confess his faith in the Lord as the only God without respect of persons, and hopes Jehovah will forgive him, if he still, so far as his earthly official situation requires, comply outwardly with idolatry, without really worshipping idols. The answer of Elisha, "Go in peace" (v. 19), contains neither approbation nor disapprobation of Naaman's religious convictions, but is the usual form of leave-taking, which in the mouth of the prophet was certainly more than a conventional form, it was a benediction in which he wished the peace of the Lord to the departing Syrian. Naaman, indeed, had not asked the prophet whether his conviction was right or wrong, whether the course proposed was well-pleasing or displeasing to the Lord, but categorically declares: may Jehovah make allowance for him in this respect, may he pardon this weakness. In this case Elisha, as he was not sent to the heathen to establish among them the exclusive worship of the true God, but was appointed to convert Israel from idolatry and bring them back to their only God and Lord, could do nothing more without a Divine commission than commit this heathen, who had become a believer, to the farther guidance of the Lord and his grace.[1]—V. 15. וְכָל־מַחֲנֵהוּ with all his camp,

[1] Most of the older theologians found in these words of the prophet an approval of the religious convictions expressed and the course intended by Naaman, and, as it was impossible for them to admit that a prophet would have approved of participation in idolatrous ceremonies even in a heathen, endeavoured to obviate the consequence issuing from their view, namely, *licitam ergo esse Christianis συμφώνησιν πιστοῦ μετὰ ἀπιστοῦ seu symbolizationem et communicationem cum ceremonia idololatrica*, either by the extremely forced explanation of the words of

that is, with all the host of his followers. בְּרָכָה (from בֵּרֵךְ to bless, wish blessing and happiness) signifies more commonly alms, gift, present, comp. Gen. xxxiii. 11; 1 Sam. xxv. 27, etc.—V. 17. וָלֹא, "but if not," comp. Ew. Gr. § 626.—V. 18. בֵּית־רִמּוֹן temple of Rimmon. רִמּוֹן the pomegranate, denotes here a deity of the Syrians, of which traces are found in the name Tabrimmon (1 Ki. xv. 8) and perhaps in the town Hadadrimmon, unless we require with Hitzig to change the mourning in Hadadrimmon (Zech. xii. 10) into a mourning over Adonis as the decaying winter Sun. Movers (d. Phönig. i. p. 197 f.), referring to the fact that Hadad was the supreme god of the Syrians, considers Rimmon an abbreviated form of Hadad-Rimmon, and the god to be a deity kindred with Adonis, who was so named after the pomegranate which was sacred to him. Winer (R.W. ii. 390) and Ges. (*thes.* iii. 1292) with Cler., Selden (*de Diis Syr.*) and others derive רִמּוֹן from רמם = רום and compare with it Ἐλιοῦν (of Sanchun.) = עֶלְיוֹן *Deus excelsus s. summus.* The words, "and he leaneth on my hand," are to be understood, not literally, but as designating the service, which Naaman as

Naaman, that he speaks only of that which he had hitherto done, not of that which he intended to do, or with reference to the known usage of הִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת by the distinction between *incurvatio regis voluntaria et religiosa* (actual worship) and *incurvatio servilis et coacta Naemani* (mere bowing for state convenience). See the various opinions and prolix treatises on this point in Pfeiffer's *dub. vex.* p. 445 ff., J. Meyer's *Annot. ad Seder Ol.* p. 904 ff., Stark's *notae sell. ad. h. l.* and Buddeus' *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 360 f. But this consequence is not obviated either by the assumption, that Naaman bowed before his God only out of civil respect without worshipping him, even if we admit, that he had confessed his faith with sufficient publicity, so that no one could have any doubt of the matter, of which, however, nothing is said, or by the assumption, that the prophet did not expressly sanction his view, so long as we, on the one hand, regard the words of Naaman as a question, concerning which he wished to hear the opinion of the prophet, because on this supposition his answer, "go in peace," contains a tacit approval of his view, or, on the other hand, leave out of view the fact, that Naaman, though a believer among the heathen, was still not a member of the covenant people, and therefore Elisha, as the prophet of the old covenant, had no Divine commission, to oblige one standing without the covenant of God with Israel to renounce all heathenish practices, to which the disciples and confessors of Christ were appointed and bound by the express command of the Lord (Matt. xxviii. 19 f.)

adjutant had to render to his king, comp. vii. 2—17. On the Chaldee form הִשְׁתַּחֲוָיָתִי comp. Ew. Gr. § 331.—V. 19. כִּבְרַת אֶרֶץ "a field length" (Luth.) denotes a very short distance here, and Gen. xxxv. 16, xlviii. 7. The etymology of כברת is uncertain, see *Lud. de Dieu crit. s.* c. 19 and Ges. *thes.* ii. 658.

Vv. 20—27. Scarcely was Naaman departed, when Gehazi was seized with a desire of a part of the Syrian's costly presents that were rejected by his master. He therefore ran after him and begged of Naaman, who had, out of profound respect for his master, alighted out of his chariot at his approach, in the name of his master, a talent of silver and two changes of raiment, as he pretended, for two poor scholars of the prophets, who had come from mount Ephraim to Elisha. Naaman forces on him two talents of silver, and courteously sends them with the changes of raiment to the hill beside the dwelling of Elisha, where Gehazi gets rid of the bearers and conceals his treasure. Immediately after he appears again before his master, as if he had not left the house, but the prophet, to whom the affair had been revealed in spirit, accosts him with the question, Whence comest thou, Gehazi? and on his lying answer, that he had gone no whither, upbraids him with all he had done, and denounces on him the punishment, that the leprosy of Naaman shall cleave to him and his family for ever, a punishment which is forthwith inflicted. This heavy infliction was not too severe for the crime of Gehazi. For it was not the covetousness alone that was punished, but at the same time the ill use made of the prophet's name to gain an object prompted by a mean covetousness, and the attempt to conceal it by lying. *Pœna haec fuit non modo intempestivae δωροδοκίας (acceptionis munerum), sed vel maxime mendacii. Nam qui prophetam circa ea quae ad munus ipsius pertinent, circumvenire vult, mentiri dicitur spiritui sancto, cujus instrumenta sunt prophetae. Vide Act. v.* 3. Grot. V. 20. חָשַׂךְ אֶת נַע׳—מִקַּחַת מִיָּדוֹ, he has refrained from Naaman, that is, spared to take from his hand. On כִּי אִם after חַי יי׳ see above p. 29.—V. 21. The quick leaping down (נפל comp. Gen. xxiv. 64) of Naaman from his chariot, at the approach of Gehazi, is a token of grateful and respectful complaisance, which Naaman wished to show the prophet in the person of his servant. Quite unsuitable are the

proofs, quoted by several expositors from accounts of travels, of the courtesy which Christians and Jews in the East *are compelled* to show to distinguished Moslemans when they meet them by alighting from vehicles and asses. V. 23. The loose connection of the words כִּכָּרַיִם כֶּסֶף, which occurs elsewhere also (see Ew. Gr. § 499, 515), is here well chosen, *ne pereat indicium numeri* (Win.) V. 24. הָעֹפֶל *the* hill, either that on which the city of Samaria was built, or the well-known hill in the neighbourhood of Elisha's house. V. 26. The ambiguous words: לֹא לִבִּי הָלַךְ I understand with Win. (*lex.* p. 253) and Maur., *non abierat (evanuerat) animus meus*, that is, I was there in spirit. So Theod., Grot., Cler., and others, with reference to 1 Cor. v. 3. —"Is it a time to receive silver, and to receive garments, and olive trees, etc.," that is, is it now, when so many hypocrites, from selfishness and avarice, pretend to be prophets, and bring the prophetic office into general contempt with the unbelieving and idolatrous, a time for a servant of the true God to receive money and goods for that which God has wrought by him, in order to acquire for himself earthly power and property?—V. 27. The expression מְצֹרָע כַּשָּׁלֶג, plainly pointing out the white leprosy, is also found in Ex. iv. 6, and Num. xii. 10.

---

## CHAPTER VI. vv. 1—23.

### ELISHA MAKES IRON SWIM, VV. 1—7, AND SMITES THE SYRIANS WITH BLINDNESS, VV. 8—23.

Vv. 1—7. The brief narrative of these verses gives us a glimpse of the humble circumstances of the scholars of the prophets. When their number was so enlarged in one place,[1] that the building designed for their common meeting was too small

[1] Almost all expositors take this place for Gilgal; but this assumption rests merely on the erroneous supposition, refuted in ii. 1, that Gilgal lay in the valley of the Jordan. Jericho is probably to be understood.

for them, they resolved, with the concurrence of Elisha, upon erecting a common residence, and proceeded for this purpose to the bank of the Jordan, which was overgrown with trees, in order to cut down the requisite timber. In this labour the iron (the axe) fell into the water, and Elisha, by cutting down a piece of wood and casting it in where the axe had fallen, caused the iron to swim, so that the scholar, who was sorely vexed by the loss of the axe, which was not bought but received as a present, is able to take it up again. As to the miracle, Elisha employs indeed a natural means; but the wood cast into the water, even if Elisha, as the natural expounders of miracles think, had thrown it so dexterously, that the stick had fallen directly into the hole designed for the reception of the handle,[1] could not possibly make the axe swim on the water. Would that the expositors, who believe this, would only make the trial, in order to convince themselves by practice of the untenableness of their theory! For they would no longer venture to censure the old Dr Luther, because he has not translated correctly, when he, because it was well known to him, that no man can bring an axe to swim with a stick, regarding clearness of thought more than the grammatical form, freely translated: "the iron swam." וַיָּצֶף from צוּף means, "he caused to flow," comp. Deut. xi. 4—he made the iron to flow as the water, that is, to swim on the water. —The dispute of the older theologians, whether the building to be erected by the scholars of the prophets was designed merely for a place of assembly for hearing the expositions of Elisha or for a common dwelling, it is not so easy to decide from our narrative. The expression in verse 1, "The place where we sit before thee" (יֹשְׁבִים לְפָנֶיךָ), points to a place of assembly; on the contrary the words: let us make us a place לָשֶׁבֶת שָׁם (v. 2) are more in favour of a dwelling place. If we compare with this the narrative iv. 38 ff. we shall be constrained even by v. 1 to think

[1] This also could not happen naturally, because the Jordan, between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, is very deep, in the neighbourhood of Jericho ten or twelve feet, and has a rapid stream with muddy waters. And if in summer, at its lowest water-mark, it be passable at some fords, we are not to suppose this here, because in this case the scholar of the prophets might have himself got the axe out of the water.

of a common dwelling, without conceiving it, however, as a formal cloister. It appears also to follow from v. 2, that they wish to erect the new building near the Jordan; for שָׁם as well as מִשָּׁם must refer to the Jordan.—V. 5. אֶת־הַבַּרְזֶל is not to be regarded as the nominative (comp. Ew. Gr. § 494), but as the object: "As to the iron, it fell into the water." After "Alas, master!" is to be supplied, my axe is lost. The omission of this thought is to be explained from the great consternation, in which the speaker expresses only that which was to him most important at the moment, that the lost axe had been obtained by begging. All interpreters render שָׁאוּל by lent; but שָׁאַל means only: to ask, demand, entreat, never to borrow.[1] That the meaning, to beg, in the *paul* participle, begged, suits here also is evident. The distress of the scholar of the prophets is so great, because his axe fallen into the water was begged, that in his poverty he had not bought but begged and received it as a gift.

Vv. 8—23. The blindness of the Syrians. Vv. 8—14. In a war, which the Syrians carried on against Israel by predatory incursions (v. 23), Elisha on several occasions disclosed to king Jehoram the place which the Syrians intended to surround, and thereby directed him to counter measures, by which the plan of the enemy was defeated. When this occurred several times, the

[1] Winer in his *lex. s. v.* quotes only our passage for this meaning, as he has rightly acknowledged, that in Ex. iii. 22, xi. 12, xii. 35, which most interpreters so explain with Gesen., the usual meaning *petere* suffices. And if this rational philologist asserts even for the *hiph.* הִשְׁאִיל in Ex. xii. 35 and 1 Sam. i. 28 the only correct meaning, *dedit*, to bestow (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. iii. p. 524); he will certainly be willing to explain שָׁאוּל 1 Sam. i. 28, which is not settled by him, not by *lent* or *borrowed*, because hence the absurd thought arises, that the pious Hannah, when she presented to the Lord her son Samuel asked of the Lord in his sanctuary, said to Eli: for this child I prayed and the Lord granted me the petition that I asked of him (אֶת־שְׁאֵלָתִי אֲשֶׁר שָׁאַלְתִּי מֵעִמּוֹ). Therefore also will I *lend* him to the Lord (הִשְׁאִלְתִּיהוּ); all the days of his life he shall be lent (שָׁאוּל) to the Lord, instead of, therefore will I also give him to the Lord, that is, willingly and gladly present him, that he may all his life be bestowed to the Lord.

Syrian king declared his suspicion that some of his servants betrayed his plans to the enemy, but on making enquiry receives the answer, that the prophet Elisha tells the king of Israel all that he (the Syrian king) speaks in his bed-chamber. Thereupon he resolved to have the prophet, then residing at Dothan, seized or taken prisoner by a body of troops sent thither. The right view of the whole proceeding depends on the conception of the words הִשָּׁמֶר מֵעֲבֹר וגו׳ (v. 9.) The Rabb. understand them so, that the Syrian king laid ambuscades in several places for the king of Israel, in order to take him, whereupon Elisha warned Jehoram not to visit such and such places, and to beware of the snares of the Syrians. Accordingly Schulz and Dathe understand the words in question (*eumque monuit) ut sibi caveret, quominus in illum locum veniret, sc. secure, nihil mali timens.* But עָבַר מָקוֹם may certainly mean, to invade a place (with hostile intent) or march through a place, but not *in locum venire.* Still less warrant is there for the supplying of *secure,* which is necessary to the sense in this view. We must therefore understand the words with Seb. Schm., Cler., Stark (*not. sel.*), de Wette, and others : *cave tibi, quo minus illum locum praetereas, i.e., negligas,* that thou overlook this place, leave it unoccupied, for the Syrians intend to attack it—נְחִתִּים properly coming down upon it. On the doubtful form נְחִתִּים Ew. (Gr. § 385, p. 246) remarks, that it might be the *niph.* participle of חָתַת, Winer (*lex.* p. 617) regards it as an Aramaising plural form of the *kal* participle of נחת with *daghesh euph.* The meaning of the word, however, is by no means doubtful, as the *niph.* of נָחַת in Ps. xxxviii. 3 means to descend, and verbs פנ׳ often coincide in form with verbs עע׳. V. 10. The words לֹא־אַחַת וגו׳ "not once, not twice," are logically and grammatically connected with וְנִשְׁמַר שָׁם. V. 11. מִי מִשֶּׁלָּנוּ אֶל וגו׳ "who of ours is for the king of Israel?" is devoted to him, adheres to him. V. 13. Dothan or Dothaim, where Joseph was sold by his brethren, lay twelve Roman miles north of Samaria in the plain of Esdraelon, in a narrow pass through the mountains (Judith, 4, 5. 7, 3), on the caravan road from Gilead to Egypt, (comp. Winer R. W. i. p. 323); the site has not yet been discovered, although the monks show the supposed pit of Joseph (see Rob. Pal. iii. p. 576).

Vv. 15—17. When the Syrians, in order to seize the prophet, had surrounded Dothan by night, Elisha's servant was greatly terrified when, on going out the following morning, he discovered this, and said to him, "Alas! my master, how shall we do?" But the latter encouragingly said, "Fear not, for they that are with us are more than they that are with them,"[1] and thereupon prayed the Lord to open the eyes of his servant, whereupon the latter saw the mountain full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha.—The eyes of the prophet's servant, which the Lord opens, are not those of the body, but of the spirit; the opening of the eyes denotes the transference into the ecstatic state, in which the spirit sees things which the bodily eye cannot see, because they belong not to the material but to the spiritual world.[2] The fiery horses and chariots have here a meaning somewhat different from that in ii. 11. There the horses and chariot are only the vehicle for the ascent into heaven; here they are the symbols of the Divine power and protection (comp. ii. 12.) The fiery form denotes, however, in both places, the supernatural Divine origin; for fire, the most ethereal of the earthly elements, is the most appropriate symbol of the Godhead. That which Elisha sees, moreover, is more than a mere "fine expression of thought, that the eye of faith sees the sure protection of God, where all is dark to the ordinary eye" (Köster i. p. q. p. 91.) The sight has reality, certainly not material but spiritual reality, even as faith in the higher protection of God rests upon the reality of the Divine omnipotence and providence.

Vv. 18—20. As soon as the Syrians came down to him (Elisha), they were at his entreaty smitten with blindness, whereupon he told them, that this was not the right way nor the right city, he would lead them to the man whom they sought, and then led them to Samaria, where, at his prayer, their eyes were again opened, so that they knew whither they had been led. וַיֵּרְדוּ

[1] The believing confidence of Elisha, expressed in these words and his prayer, rest "on Gen. xxxii. 2, 3, where Jacob, when danger threatens him from Esau, sees himself surrounded by a double camp of angels." Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 137 f.

[2] So also the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, that he saw the angel intercepting his way, whom his natural eye had not seen, Num. xxii. 13. Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bil. p. 60.

אֵלָיו is referred by Budd., J. H. Mich. and Fr. v. Meyer, to Elisha and his servant—These went down to the Syrian host. But the supposition, on account of which these theologians felt themselves compelled to deviate from the other much more obvious and generally received meaning, "The Syrians came down to him (Elisha)," namely, that Elisha was upon a mountain, the Syrians, on the contrary, in a valley, so that they could go not down, but only up, by no means follows from this, that Elisha's servant sees the mountain full of fiery chariots and horses round about Elisha; but we may very well understand this description so that he saw the fiery chariots and horses on the same mountain surrounding the city, which the Syrians occupied in a line encompassing the city, whereby the Syrians in the vision perhaps quite vanished from his view, as in ecstacy the bodily eye is usually closed. See the proofs of this in Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bil. p. 137 ff. The blindness, with which the Syrians were smitten, is also mental blindness, a state of mental illusion in which a man with seeing eyes yet sees not what is right (comp. Jos. vi. 10.) This fact also, as many expositors have noticed, has its foundation in the Pentateuch, in Gen. xix. 11, where the Sodomites were smitten with blindness by the angel of the Lord, the only other passage in which סַנְוֵרִים is found. V. 19. The words of Elisha, "This is not the way," etc., contain an untruth, and are to be judged of as every stratagem, by which the enemy is deceived.[1]

Vv. 21—23. Elisha forbade king Jehoram to slay the enemies led to him, because he had not taken them in war, and advised him rather to entertain them well and send them back to their master. The object of this measure was to show the Syrians that they had to do with a prophet of Jehovah, against whom they could avail nothing, and thus to make them aware of the authority of the prophet, and therein the omnipotence of the God of Israel. This object would have been defeated if Jehoram had put to death these enemies when delivered into his hands, be-

[1] The scruples, which Michaelis raises against the verisimilitude of what is related v. 20, only prove that he had less faith in the Divine power of the prophet than Jehoram the king of Israel had: they cannot shake the truth of the narrative.

cause the exasperation thereby produced would have prevented the recognition of the Divine omnipotence revealing itself in this occurrence.[1] And even in a political point of view this course was more correct and conducive to peace than the execution proposed by the king, as the event shewed (see v. 23.) The enemies were mentally conquered, and renounced the attempt to establish in the old way a material supremacy.—On אָבִי comp. v. 13.—The words, v. 22. הַאֲשֶׁר . . . מַכֶּה most expositors understand as a question, "wouldst thou smite those whom . . ." that is, as thou dost not otherwise slay thy prisoners of war but sparest their lives, much less mayest thou slay those whom thou hast not taken in war. But this argument would rest on a supposition which Jehoram had scarcely warranted, namely, that he had acted more mildly toward his enemies than the custom and right of war and the law of Moses (Deut. xx. 13) required. But even if this supposition were well-founded, how shall we reconcile with it the fact, that the otherwise so mild king here all at once wished to act more strictly than the law required, and the customs of war in all not utterly barbarous nations allowed, and to put to the sword enemies whom he had not taken in open battle? Regarded as a question, then, they appear to me to give no tolerable sense, although even Ew. (Gr. § 443) still holds the הַ before אֲשֶׁר to be interrogative? I therefore understand them with the Chald., Syr., de Wette, and Maur., thus: those whom thou takest with sword and bow, that is, in open battle, thou mayest put to death, as the law demands, but not those whom I have brought to thee. This sense the context evidently demands. But whether the הַ before אֲשֶׁר be the article in the sense of the demonstrative pronoun, as Ges. (Lehrgeb. p. 754, and Gr. § 122 *a)* assumes, or is to be taken with Maur. for an error of the pen, I venture not to determine. Maurer's objection, that הַ the article should not have a pattach before אָ, is set aside by the assumption, that the Masor. regarded it as the article.—V. 23. "And he prepared for them a great entertainment." כָּרָה כֵּרָה means here to prepare a banquet; on

[1] *Εἰ σφαγεῖεν, φησὶν, οὐ γνωσθήσεται τῆς θαυματουργίας τὸ μέγεθος· εἰ δὲ ὑγιεῖς ἀπέλθοιεν πρὸς τὸν ἀποστέλλοντα, μαθήσεται κᾀκεῖνος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἡμετέρου τὴν δύναμιν.* Theod. and Procop.

this all interpreters are agreed, but it is very difficult to derive this meaning from כָּרָה. Winer (*lex. s.v.*) assumes three stems united in the word כרה with the following primary meanings. 1. *fodit* = كرا and كرى. 2. *emit* = كرو *conduxit rem.* 3. *epulas instituit* = قرى *hospitio excepit*, Ges. (*thes.* ii. 711 f.) only two, *fodit* and *emit*, as also Fürst in *Concord. s.v.* Both connect the meaning required by the context in our passage with *emit*, Gesen. without any intervening ideas, Fürst by the middle term *parare* and the comparison with חָרָה *coquere* (? in what dialect has חרה this meaning ?) *de apparatu epuli.* With regard to the appeal to Arabic usage قرى corresponds to the Heb. קרא to call, in the sense of inviting, bidding to a feast, not, as Gesen. *l. c.* ii. 712 conjectures, in the sense *obviam eundi*, and كرو has certainly, in conj. vi. and viii., the assigned meaning *conduxit rem*, but in conj. i. it means only *fodit*, and is = كرى, comp. Freytag, *lex. Arab.* iv. p. 31. The appeal to the Arab. therefore proves nothing; and even if there were actually two verbal stems in Arabic كرو and كرى of different primary meanings, yet it is first to be enquired, whether they do not run back to a common primary meaning before we venture to transfer the usage of the richer and more cultivated dialect to the poorer and less developed Hebrew language, as the formation of language proceeds naturally, not to the combining of several roots into one, but inversely to the splitting up of unity into multiplicity. We are thus sent back to the Hebrew speech usage. In this the meaning *emit* does not appear from Deut. ii. 6 and Hos. iii. 2 as an independent primary meaning collateral with *fodit*, but כרה in both places may be explained from the fundamental meaning *fodit*. At the basis of the expression, Deut. ii. 6, כָּרָה מַיִם בְּכֶסֶף to procure water with money, lies the reference to the digging of cisterns (Gen. xxvi. 25; Ex. xxi. 33, etc.) whereby water was usually procured, and in Hos. iii. 2, כרה means nothing but procuring, acquiring, gaining possession, after the custom mentioned, Deut. xv. 17; comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 29. The *rad.* כרה has on the whole only one primary meaning, namely, *fodit*, to dig. The idea of digging passes, however, gradually into the wider idea of making ready, preparing, pro-

curing,—*parare, apparare, comparare.* This transition is seen in such passages as Gen. l. 5, where in the words of Jacob, "Bury me in my grave אֲשֶׁר כָּרִתִי לִי in the land of Cannan," כרה means not to dig, but to make ready; for Jacob had digged no grave for himself in Canaan, but merely possessed there a hereditary burial place purchased by Abraham in the cave of Machpelah in Hebron, in which he wished to be buried, comp. Gen. xlix. 31 f. with xxiii. 19 f. The meaning *parare* suffices also in our passage, כָּרָה כֵּרָה גְדוֹלָה means only *paravit apparatum magnum.* That this providing, preparing, refers to an entertainment, is implied, not in the words by themselves, but in the connection, in the words, "set bread and water before them," and "they ate and drank." The last words: "And the bands of Aram came no more into the land of Israel," are not to be restricted by supplements, such as, for a long time, or *vivente Elisa* (C. a Lap.), but the thought is: the incursions of the Syrians in predatory bands ceased from this time, although the regular war related in the following passage was not thereby excluded.

---

## CHAPTER VI. 24—VII. 20.

### ELISHA ANNOUNCES, DURING A FAMINE IN SAMARIA, THE SUDDEN OCCURRENCE OF GREAT CHEAPNESS.

Vv. 24—29. In a siege by Benhadad there arose so dreadful a famine in Samaria, that a mother accused another before the king of not keeping her agreement to slay her child for food, as she herself had done.—V. 25. "Until an ass's head cost eighty shekels of silver, and the fourth part of a cab of dove's dung five shekels of silver." The ass was an unclean animal, and its flesh therefore was not allowed to be eaten; but necessity knows no law. The head of the ass is besides the worst part of the whole animal to eat. Eighty shekels, as the common or state shekel only can be meant here, which Bertheau (z. Gesch. d. Isr. p. 49)

computes at (10½ grs.) 15¾ pence, amount to about £5, 5s. A fourth part of a cab = a ξέστης (Joseph. *Antiq.* ix. 4, 4), was the smallest dry measure of the Hebrews, 27.58 Paris cub. inches (see Bertheau, p. 65 and 73.) Five shekels 6s 4d.—חרייונים, according to the Kethibh, is to be read חֲרֵי יוֹנִים. *excrementa columbarum*, for which the Masor. have substituted the euphemistic דִּיב יוֹנִים *fluxus, profluvium columbarum*. The meaning of the word is certain, but it is doubtful whether the phrase here means actual dove's dung, or, after the analogy of the German expression, devil's dung, for asafetida, only a wretched article of food from the vegetable kingdom, to us unknown. Bochart (hieroz. B. i. C. 7), after he has set aside as erroneous seven different opinions, for example, that dove's dung was used as salt and spices, or for fuel, or for manuring the fields in the city, and so on, has endeavoured with great learning to prove, that dove's dung here means roasted chick peas, called by the Arabs properly أُشْنان, and oftener improperly dove's or sparrow's dung.[1] In this proof so much is correct, that اشنان *herba Alcali* is called by the Arabs also dove's or sparrow's dung; but the farther proof, that this plant is *ciceris genus*, rests, as Celsius has shown (hierob. ii. p. 233 f.), on a confusion of حمص *cicer* with حمض *salsa et amara planta*, in the Arabic authors quoted by Bochart. The reasons, however, by which Cels. ii. p. 30 ff. wishes to prove the proper meaning of the expression, the only one admissible in our passage, are not absolutely binding, although Joseph. (*de bello Jud.* v. 13, 7) relates that in the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the famine was so extreme, that men searched the sewers and gathered old dung and excrement for food, to which Cels. *l.c.* has added two testimonies from the Spanish and English histories of the fourteenth century. These facts prove no doubt the possibility, even the probability, of the literal meaning, but not its necessity, for which reason we refrain with Gesenius (thes. i. 516) from deciding.—V. 27. אַל־יוֹשִׁעֵךְ יי׳ "Nay! Jehovah help thee." Maur. has justly

[1] Roasted chick peas are eaten in the East as a delicacy for a dessert, see Harm. Beobacht. i. p. 255 f.

declared against the explanation of אַל by *nisi*, but his own meaning *vereor ut Deus te servet* is not warranted by the passages he quotes, Ps. xli. 3, l. 3, cxxi. 3, Song vii. 3, for in all these places אַל stands before the future in the sense, may he not. Thus it would be necessary to understand it, may Jehovah not help thee, and the sense assigned by Cler. *perdat te Jehova*, would be obtained. The other meaning proposed by Maur. can alone be maintained: *ne sc. me adeas precibus tuis*, nay, that is, do not this, speak not to me for help. אַל has certainly this meaning in Ruth i. 13. Maur. is wrong also, when he explains the words, "Whence shall I help thee? From the threshing-floor, or the wine-press," as the most bitter irony on the part of the excessively provoked king. For the king is extremely excited only by the following heart-rending recital of the woman. The words have simply the meaning, I can help thee neither with corn nor wine, with nothing either to eat or drink, because I myself have nothing more. If he had been exasperated at first by her cry for help, he would not have farther enquired: מַה־לָּךְ what is thy request? (v. 28.)[1]

Vv. 30—33. Horrified by the shocking recital of the woman, the king rends his garment (comp. on v. 7), whereby it becomes manifest, that he wears a penitential garment (שַׂק comp. on 1 Ki. xxi. 27) on his body. But whether the horror of the king arose from the whole import of the curses and denunciations of the law being brought to his mind by the horrible revelation of the woman, is not quite so evident as Hengstenb. ii. p. 138 f. assumes. For had he instantly recognised therein the curse of the Divine law, this would have led him also immediately to sincere humiliation before the Lord, and not to the imprecation, that God would punish him, if the head of Elisha remain on him to-day. This imprecation, which he wishes immediately to execute, proves, that his distress of mind was no wholesome

[1] On vv. 28 and 29 Grot., Cler., and others have remarked, referring to Lev. xxv. 29; Deut. xxviii. 53—57, that here the curse of the law, that the mother shall eat the flesh of her own children, is literally fulfilled. A judgment which was also repeated at the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and Titus, see Lam. iv. 10, and Joseph. *de bello Jud.* vi. 3, 4.

fruit of the recognition of his own guilt such as the law coming to his view must have produced, but only a consequence of his contemplating the heart-rending misery that now for the first time stands before his eyes in all its frightfulness, for which he wished to wreak his vengeance on the prophet, whom he held to be the prime cause of the appalling necessity, probably because he had given the advice, not to surrender the city on any condition, with the promise that God would deliver them if they humbled themselves before him in sincere repentance, and implored his aid. By putting on a garment of hair, the king believed that he had done his part; and since, notwithstanding this, the expected help did not come, he fell into a rage, which was to be expended on the prophet. This rage arose indeed only from a momentary ebullition of anger, and soon gave way to the better voice of conscience: the king hastened after the messenger, whom he had sent to behead Elisha, in order himself to prevent the execution of the death order which he had given in the haste of his burning rage (v. 32); but it proves that true repentance, which springs from the recognition of the necessity as a judgment imposed by the Lord, was still wanting in the king. The act of desperation to which his violent passion had hurried him would have taken place, had not the Lord protected his prophet, and revealed to him the design of the king, so that he could take measures to prevent it.—V. 32. The elders of the city were assembled in the house of the prophet, probably to ask counsel and aid of the man of God, when the king sent (וַיִּשְׁלַח) a man from before him (namely, to behead the prophet), but before the messenger came to him (Elisha), the prophet informed the elders of the design of the king: "See ye, that this son of a murderer (Jehoram, according to pedigree and disposition, was a genuine son of Ahab, the murderer of the prophets, and of the innocent Naboth) sends to take away my head," and commanded them to shut the door against the messenger, and to drive him back at the door, because he already heard the noise of his master's feet after him. The step of Elisha was no resistance of the lawful authorities, but only a precaution, by which he prevented the execution of an unrighteous sentence of death pronounced in haste, and thereby did the king himself a ser-

vice.—In v. 33 the brevity of the expression occasions some obscurity, which is to be removed by supplying some thoughts which lie in the connection. "While he (Elisha) yet talked with them (the elders) behold, the messenger came down unto him—*and he said.*" From the subsequent import of the speech that follows, it appears that it was not Elisha who spoke, nor the messenger who arrived, but the king. The words: "Behold, this evil comes of the Lord. Why should I wait for the Lord any longer?" are suitable neither in the mouth of the messenger sent to execute the sentence of death, nor in the mouth of the king's minister, who, according to vii. 2, had come to the prophet, but only in that of the king, on whom the decision concerning the fate of the city depended. This is put beyond doubt by vii. 17 f. We must therefore supply the performance of that which Elisha (v. 32) said to the elders, namely, "and after him (the messenger, at his feet) followed the king," who naturally was immediately admitted to the prophet, "and he (the king) said." His words, this evil comes from the Lord, etc., are the words of a despairing man, in whose soul, however, a trace of faith is still concealed. For in the very fact that he shows this frame of mind before the prophet, he lets it be understood that he still cherishes a feeble glimmer of hope and confidence in the Lord, and wishes to be directed and encouraged by the prophet. This encouragement is accordingly imparted to him.

Chap. vii. vv. 1, 2. Elisha announces a cheapness of provisions on the following day, as great as was the dearth on this day. A seah (the third part of an Ephah, see on 1 Ki. xviii. 32), of fine flour סֹלֶת, comp. on 1 Ki. v. 2), for a shekel and 2 seahs of barley for the same price. At the gate of Samaria, that is, in the market of Samaria, comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. vi. p. 272.—V. 2. With contemptuous scorn the unbelieving minister of the king answers: "Behold, the Lord will make windows in heaven," namely, in order to rain down corn or meal, see Mal. iii. 10. The scoffing lies in the הִנֵּה, which most expositors have erroneously taken for a conditional particle, *if*, and in the allusion to Gen. vii. 11 (comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 139.) But Elisha replies to him with the solemn threatening, "Behold, thou shalt see it with thine eyes, but shalt not eat thereof."

The fulfilment, see in v. 17 ff.—On שָׁלִישׁ, comp. on 1 Ki. ix. 22, and on אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁעָן, on 2 Ki. v. 18. The לְ in לַמֶּלֶךְ is very strange, as it seems here to stand for the nominative, which is contrary to the fundamental meaning of לְ. If it is not admissible to repeat the relative אֲשֶׁר before נִשְׁעָן, and regard לַמֶּלֶךְ as a circumlocution for the genitive, we must consider the latter with Maurer as an error of the pen for הַמֶּלֶךְ.

V. 3 ff. With these verses begins the historical account of the fulfilment of the word of the Lord uttered by Elisha, with the simple relation of the occurrence, that first the flight of the Syrians was discovered by some lepers, who, to escape death by famine, went to the camp of the enemy and found it empty (vv. 3—5), whereupon the cause of the sudden raising of the siege and flight of the besiegers is introduced (vv. 6, 7), that these lepers then resolved to bring this intelligence to the city and report it to the king (vv. 8—11), that on this the king satisfied himself of the truth of the information received (vv. 12—15), and that, finally, by the plunder of the camp of the Syrians, the predicted cheapness arrived (v. 16), and therewith also the judgment pronounced upon the unbelieving minister was realized (vv. 17—20.)

Vv. 3—5. "Four men were as lepers before the gate," as the law of Moses (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 3) commanded, perhaps in a separate building designed for this purpose (comp. xv. 5), in order to exclude them as unclean from the congregation of the Lord for the reasons stated on v. 1. *Videmus itaque legem Mosaicam in tanta cultus Divini corruptione non tamen plane exolevisse in Israele.* Seb. Schm. Comp. also Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 139 f.—V. 5. נֶשֶׁף denotes here the evening twilight, not the morning twilight or last watch of the night (Cler., Budd., J. H. Mich., and others.) This appears from v. 12, according to which the king still in the night receives the intelligence of the flight of the Syrians—"The end of the Syrian camp" is its boundary towards the city. The Syrians probably had blockaded Samaria, which was on a hill, at the foot of the ascent, in order to starve them into a surrender.

Vv. 6, 7. The Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots and horses, a noise of a great host, so that they

thought the king of Israel had engaged the kings of the Hittites and Egyptians against them to surprise them, and had fled, leaving behind them their whole camp in order to save their lives. This miracle, by which God wrought deliverance for Samaria from death by famine or surrender to the enemy, consisted thus in an illusion of the hearing, so that they thought they heard the march of two hostile armies, and such a panic seized them that they took to flight in great haste and disorder, without even taking time to carry away their baggage, their beasts of draught or burden (v. 11.) Whether any objective reality, as a rustling in the sky, lay at the ground of the noise which they heard and took for the noise of an approaching hostile army, or that which was heard consisted in a purely subjective delusion, that had reality only in so far as it was wrought by God, this cannot be determined, nor is it a matter of any importance. The Divine causality is the same in both cases. It is moreover a well known fact that, especially in mountainous regions, if the ear be laid to the ground, the sound of an army on the march may be heard at a considerable distance.—*Kings of the Hittites* (Chittim) is a general designation of the northern kings of Canaan on Lebanon and towards Phœnicia; the name חִתִּים stands more frequently in a wider sense for the Canaanites in general, comp. on 1 Ki. x. 29, so that our verse with the passage quoted does not warrant the conclusion of Bertheau (z. Gesch. d. Isr. p. 158), "that a part of the Hittites dispossessed by the Israelites retreated into more northern districts in Syria." *Kings of the Egyptians* are put for the kings advancing from the south. From the plural מַלְכֵי it does not follow that the Egyptians at that time had several kings; the plural is explained by this, that the Egyptians stand as *species pro genere* for the southern, as the Hittites for the northern nations. The Syrians speak not of the historically certain, but from a mere conjecture founded upon the noise heard. On אֶל־נַפְשָׁם see on 1 Ki. xix. 3.

Vv. 8—11. When the lepers found the camp of the Syrians empty and forsaken, they first satiated themselves with the provisions found in the tents, and then brought away for themselves several valuables which they concealed; but presently their conscience accused them, and they said, "We do not right, this

day is a day of good tidings, we are silent and wait till the morning light, and guilt will fall upon us. *Officium enim civium est ea indicare quae ad salutem publicam pertinent.* Grot. They resolved, therefore, to report the joyful event to the palace of the king, and went and notified it to the porter. שֹׁעֵר הָעִיר the gate keeper; the singular stands as generic idea for the plurality of individuals, who kept the watch; this explains the following לָהֶם comp. Ew. Gr. § 571. Maur. has therefore rightly rejected the conjecture of Dathe שֹׁעֲרֵי. כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה as they were, that is, as was usual, in a camp.—V. 11. Many after Kimchi translate וַיִּקְרָא וגו׳, "And he (the spokesman of the four lepers), called the keepers;" others, on the contrary, after the LXX, "And they (the keepers) called and told it to the king's palace within." This latter view Maur. rejects as *falsa interpretatio*, but unjustly; this conception is rather the natural one, though the other is possible. If ויקרא were merely a repetition of וַיִּקְרְאוּ (v. 10), it would certainly be again constructed with אֶל, as the sense demands the meaning, to call to one, in which קרא is never connected with *accus. pers.*, which it has only in the signification *clamando arcessere* and *invocare*. On the use of the singular with a following *plur. subjecti* see Ew. Gr. § 567.

Vv. 12—15. The king suspected in the unexpected retreat of the Syrians only a stratagem, and thought they intended by a pretended flight to decoy the besieged from their fortress in order to fall upon them in the open field, and to break into the city. On account of this suspicion we are not with Seb. Schm. and others to accuse him of an *ingens incredulitas*, because similar devices in war are by no means rare (comp. several examples in Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii., 233 f.), and Elisha had certainly predicted the sudden return of cheapness but not the flight of the Syrians. בְּהַשָּׂדֶה stands according to later speech-usage for בַּשָּׂדֶה, comp. Ew. Gr. § 463.—In order to ascertain the ground or groundlessness of the suspicion expressed by the king concerning the flight of the Syrians, at the suggestion of one of the king's servants (counsellors) two pairs of horses (two war chariots) are sent to reconnoitre, who follow the Syrian host unto Jordan and find the whole way full of traces of the

most precipitate flight in garments and vessels which they had cast away. The meaning of the advice (v. 13), which is altogether misunderstood and pronounced to be obscure by some expositors, while it is not at all doubtful but only somewhat prolixly expressed, is simply this, we wish to send five of the horses that remain in the city; if they be taken or slain by the Syrians, in case their flight be only pretended, they meet with no worse lot than all the remaining people in the city, who are still left, but encounter death by hunger, or have been already swept away by the famine. The sending out of the horses implies of itself the sending of men with them; this explains in the simplest manner the parallel drawn between their lot and that of the Israelites in the city. The phrase הִנָּם כְּ makes more prominent the correspondence of the two parties, behold, even so. —14. שְׁנֵי רֶכֶב סוּסִים are not two horses, but two yoke of horses, that is, two pairs of horses yoked to two chariots, see on 1 Ki. v. 6. The difficulty, which Kimchi and others have started, that in v. 13 mention is made of five horses, but according to v. 14 only four are sent, is scarcely worth mentioning, as it is obvious, that five is stated in v. 13 as a round number. On the article in כָּל־הֶהָמוֹן, comp. Ew. Gr. § 515.—בהחפזם (v. 15) is to be read *niph.* בְּהֵחָפְזָם, the *Keri* בְּחָפְזָם is a bad amendment; for חפז "to hasten from fear" (comp. Hengstenb. comm. on Ps. xxxi. 23, xlviii. 6) occurs only in the *niph.* with the meaning, to flee hastily, comp. Ps. xlviii. 6, civ. 7, and 1 Sam. xxiii. 6.

Vv. 16—20. As soon as they were satisfied by the report of the scouts on their return of the reality of the retreat of the Syrians, the whole populace rushed from the gate to plunder the Syrian camp, in consequence of which the cheapness of provisions predicted by Elisha was realised. To keep order at the gate in the violent crowding of the famished people out of the city, and to prevent any evil that was likely to arise from too great a pressure, the king had ordered to the gate his minister, who the day before had derided the prediction of Elisha. Here he was crushed and trodden down in the throng. This remarkable fulfilment of the word of the Lord proclaimed to him by Elisha the narrator found to be so important, that in vv. 18—20 he again repeats this prediction with its occasion and fulfilment.

## CHAPTER VIII.

ELISHA'S REPUTATION AIDS THE SHUNAMMITE IN GAINING HER RIGHTS FROM THE KING, VV. 1—6. IN DAMASCUS ELISHA ANNOUNCES THE KINGDOM TO HAZAEL, VV. 7—15. REIGN OF THE JEWISH KING JEHORAM, VV. 16—24, AND THAT OF AHAZIAH, VV. 25—29.

Vv. 1, 2. By the advice of Elisha, the Shunammite, whose son the prophet had restored to life (iv. 33 ff.), removed into the land of the Philistines during a seven years' famine in Israel. These two verses are by most old interpreters translated in the pluperfect; they manifestly form merely the introduction to the following narrative, the object of which is not to record the prediction of the seven years' famine by Elisha,[1] but to show, that the reputation of the prophet with king Jehoram had advanced so much, that the latter caused the Shunammite, for whom Elisha had done so much, to be forthwith reinstated in all her possessions. The seven years of famine in the middle of the reign of Jehoram, though we are not to conclude with Calm. from iv. 38, that this famine had already begun, when Elisha restored the child of the Shunammite; for even if the identity of the famine (iv. 38) with that of the seven years here mentioned can scarcely be doubted, yet it by no means follows from the position of section iv. 38 ff. after the raising of the dead child at Shunem, that this took place before the famine. For iv. 38 ff. is not annexed to what precedes by the Vau of the *relat. fut.* or *imperf.* indicating consecution of time. But the Rabb., C. a Lap., Seb. Schm., and others, have rightly inferred from the fact that Gehazi still talks with the king after the return of the Shunammite to her native land, that our section belongs to the time before the heal-

[1] Meyer (in Amm. u. Berth.'s Krit. Journ. iv. 226 f.) errs, therefore, when he compares this prediction of the seven years' famine with the drought announced by Elijah (1 Ki. xvii.) in order to prove that our narrative is a legend copied after the former. But it is still more erroneous in the ancients to draw from this supposed parallel a proof that Elijah's spirit rested in double measure on Elisha.

ing of Naaman the Syrian. By the words: "the Lord calls the famine into the land," the famine is represented as a Divine punishment for the idolatry of the people.

Vv. 3—6. As, while the Shunammite was sojourning abroad, others had taken possession of her house and land, she applied to the king for redress on her return. אֶל־בֵּיתָהּ in regard to her house, that is, *de fundo sibi restituendo* (Schulz. Maur.) For this we have in v. 5 עַל־בּ׳ on account of her house. By a special Divine arrangement Gehazi was at that very time recounting to the king the doings of Elisha, and particularly his raising of the dead child of the Shunammite, when she appeared before him with her petition, whereby Jehoram was so interested in her case, that he immediately charged a courtier with orders to restore not only all her possession, but also the fruits of her field during the years of her absence.[1]—On the form עָזְבָה without *mappik* and with *raphe*, comp. Ew. Gr. § 177.

Vv. 7—10. Upon this[2] Elisha came to Damascus, obviously with the view of executing the commission given to Elijah on Horeb (1 Ki. xix. 15) to nominate Hazael king of Syria. Benhadad was at the time sick, and sent, when the arrival of the man of God was announced to him, Hazael to him with a present, to enquire of Jehovah by him concerning his sickness. כָּל־טוּב (v. 9) "every kind of good thing of Damascus" is a more exact description of the מִנְחָה.—"Forty camels' burden." The present consisted no doubt of the fruits of the land, and was very considerable, because the king wished to obtain from the prophet as favourable an answer as possible; though we are not to suppose it so large that forty camels were actually necessary to carry it, nor think of computing the forty camels' burden with Deres. at 20,000 or even 32,000 lbs.; but must take into account the often attested Oriental custom of making a great display

[1] It appears, accordingly, that the State had taken possession of the abandoned property, though this is not distinctly implied in the words; the king might assign his officer to the Shunammite to aid her in recovering her rights from the unlawful occupier of her possession.

[2] The phrase וַיָּבֹא annexes the following narrative as a later occurrence to the foregoing section, though not necessarily to the last mentioned event.

with presents, and employing as many servants and beasts of burden as possible, whereby only one article was placed upon each (see Harm. Beobacht. ii. p. 29 ff., iii. p. 43; Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 17), so that the forty camels perhaps scarcely carried more than two or four animals might have carried if fully laden.[1] The expression, *thy son*, is explained by the custom mentioned at ii. 12 and vi. 21 of addressing the prophet as father.—V. 10. The words אֱמֹר לֹא חָיֹה תִחְיֶה are according to the *kethibh* to be rendered, "Say, Thou wilt not live," according to the *keri* אֱמָר־לוֹ, "Say to him, Thou wilt live." In favour of the textual reading, which Wits. (*miscell. ss. praef.* § 9) and Budd. (*hist. eccl.* ii. p. 372 f.) especially have defended, is (*a*) the general observation, that most of the *keris* are only arbitrary, unfounded, and objectionable conjectures; (*b*) that this reading is the more difficult, not only on account of the apparent contradiction in v. 14, where Hazael reports the answer of Elisha without the negative to his king, but also because the negative לֹא stands extremely seldom before the *infin. absol.*, mostly after it before the *verb. fin.*, since Ew. in his krit. Gr. p. 563 cites only two cases of that position (Gen. iii. 4 and Ps. xlix.); and (*c*) also that וְהִרְאַנִי would stand for כִּי הִרְאַנִי, "for Jehovah has shown me."[2] But important though these reasons are, the marginal reading, for which with the Chald., all the old

[1] It is not necessary, therefore, with Köster (d. Proph. p. 93) to pronounce the number forty either an error of transcription or a "hyperbole, such as the Eastern moralist loves, in order to make his moral more impressive." Moreover, it is not mentioned whether Elisha received or rejected the present. As the prophet of the Lord he certainly accepted it as little as the gifts offered by Naaman, as Paulsen (d. Reg. d. Morgenl. i. p. 183) has rightly conjectured.

[2] If besides it be maintained in favour of the *kethibh* and against the *keri*, that the Masor. might on the one hand have formed their conjecture from that which Hazael (v. 14) told the king, and have wished on the other hand to save the prophet from an untruth: the latter reason has little probability in and of itself, because Benhadad did not die of his sickness, but was murdered by Hazael, while the Masor. have not in general readily proposed textual changes from dogmatical reasons; and in reply to the former reason it may likewise be said not without an appearance of truth, that an ignorant transcriber may have changed לוֹ into לֹא, because he did not understand how the prophet could have said of Benhadad, who shortly after died, he will live.

versions, several *codd.* in Kennicott, the Masoretes,[1] and almost all expositors, even Vitringa (*observ. ss.* B. iii. C. 16) and Stark (not. sel. ad h. b.) speak, would deserve the preference. For irrespective of the position of לֹא before חָיֹה, which might perhaps be intended, that the emphasis might rest on לֹא, it is very harsh in mere prose to regard the ו before הִרְאַנִי as causal. Then we can lay no particular stress on the answer which Hazael reported to the king, since he as a wily courtier, who was already forming designs of usurpation, might not have told the king the truth, although on the other hand again, we must acknowledge that he had no sufficient grounds for such lie, as the truth might have been at least as conducive to his plans.[2] Lastly, it is in favour of the marginal reading, that, in case לֹא were negative, the pronoun לוֹ, which the sense requires, would be wanting. The meaning of the answer of the prophet according the *Keri* Kimchi (in Michaelis' bible) has correctly stated thus: *ex morbo quidem certissime non morieris, per vim tamen vita privaberis.* Elisha answers to the question proposed to him quite correctly, Of thy sickness thou wilt recover, but adds for Hazael, that he will nevertheless die, and Hazael reports to his king only the first part of the answer of the prophet, the second, which favours his design, he conceals.

Vv. 11—15. Hereupon Elisha fixed his eye long upon Hazael and wept. When Hazael asked him the cause of his weeping, he declared to him that he saw the grievous sufferings that he (Hazael) would bring on the people of Israel; and when Hazael wished to repudiate this, he said to him, Jehovah has showed thee to me as king over Aram, whereupon Hazael went away, reported to the king the answer already mentioned, but on the following day suffocated him with a wet cloth laid on his face,

[1] The Masoretes reckon this among the fifteen places of the Old Testament in which לֹא is a pronoun, not a negative particle; see *Hilleri Arcan. Keri et Ketibh*, p. 62 f.

[2] Wits. *l. c.* adopts the decision of L. Capellus: *Nisi quis forte dicat, Spiritum sanctum ideo ambigua voce* לֹא *unum hic esse, ut et Elizaei mandatum et Hazaelis factum mandato contrarium simul exprimeret. Crit. sacr.* B. iii. C. 10 § 15. But no such ambiguity lies in the expression of Elisha, as he plainly adds: The Lord hath showed me that he will surely die.

and made himself king of Syria.—V. 11. וַיַּעֲמֵד אֶת־פָּנָיו וַיָּשֶׂם "he set his face fast (upon him.") On עַד־בֹּשׁ, comp. on ii. 17. The cruel conduct of Hazael, described v. 12, in the war with Israel, is only a farther enlargement of the brief sentence which the Lord (1 Ki. xix. 17) had spoken to Elijah concerning Hazael. The historical fulfilment of the details is not indeed recorded, but the general fact is so clearly indicated in x. 32 f., xiii. 3, 4, 7, 22, that no doubt can prevail on the matter, as all the atrocities mentioned usually occurred in wars, and were also specially predicted of the kingdom of Israel by Hosea x. 14, xiii. 1. Comp. also xvi. 16; Isa. xiii. 17 f.; Nah. iii. 10; Ps. cxxxvii. 9.—שִׁלַּח בָּאֵשׁ, send into the fire, that is, set on fire; comp. Judg. i. 8, xx. 48; Ps. lxxiv. 7.—V. 13. כֶּלֶב, dog, is in the cringing language of the East an insignificant and bad man, comp. 1 Sam. xvii. 43, xxiv. 15; 2 Sam. ix. 8, Oedmann, verm. Samml. v. p. 42 f.—On v. 14, comp. v. 10. That Hazael was in fact a dog, he forthwith proves, when abusing the predictions of Elisha he on the following day murdered his king (v. 15.)[1] מַכְבֵּר from כָּבַר, to plait, cognate with מִכְמָר, a net, signifies a plaited coverlet. In accordance with Josephus (Ant. ix. 4—6, δίκτυον [διάβροχον]) J. D. Mich., and others, speak of a gnat net, κωνωπεῖον, which in warm countries is placed over the face in sleep to keep off flies and gnats; but the context is in favour of a thick cloth, as the gnat net soaked in water does not contract so much as to transmit no air. With this agree the Chald. and Syr. which render גּוּנְכָה and ܡܣܘܟܠܐ; both of which signify a thick cloth, as they are also used for שְׂמִיכָה, Judg. iv. 18.

Vv. 16—24. *Reign of Jehoram, king of Judah.* Comp. 2 Chr. xxi. 2—20, and my apolog. Vers. p. 412 ff. Jehoshaphat resigned the sovereignty to Jehoram two years before his death. There-

[1] Preceded by some ancient expositors, Schulz assumes that king Benhadad himself laid the cloth dipped in water on his face to cool it, and was thereby suffocated; but not to speak of the improbability which this assumption involves, it is quite arbitrary to assume a different subject for וַיִּחְדּוּ, and וַיִּקַּח from that of וַיֵּלֶךְ, וַיָּבֹא and the last וַיֹּאמֶר (v. 14.) Comp. also Maurer *ad h. l.*

fore is it said, v. 16, he became king, when Jehoshaphat was king of Judah (וִיהוֹשָׁפָט מֶלֶךְ יְהוּ׳.)[1]

Vv. 17—19. Through Jehoram, who had married Athaliah, daughter of Ahab (comp. v. 18 with v. 26), came the fatal consequences of the marriage of Ahab with the idolatrous princess Jezebel upon Judah also. Jehoram was the opposite of his pious father, Jehoshaphat; immediately after whose death he slew his six brothers, as it appears for no other reason than to make himself master of the treasures which his father had bequeathed to them (2 Chr. xxi. 2—4), and walked wholly in the footsteps of the house of Ahab, that is, introduced the worship of Baal also into his own kingdom.[2] This revolt from the Lord would have involved the total extirpation of the royal family in Judah as in Israel, if the Lord had not preserved a shoot, on account of the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii.) On v. 19 comp. 1 Ki. xi. 36.—לְבָנָיו is put in apposition with לוֹ to explain it, and therefore needs not the copula ו (וּלְבָנָיו.)

Vv. 20—22. The divine chastisement, however, was not wanting. Jehoram's ungodliness was punished *partim defectione Edomitarum, partim morbo pessimo aliisque plagis, ut habetur*, 2 Chr. xxi. 12 sqq. Seb. Schm.—Edom, which had hitherto a governor with the title of king, tributary to the kingdom of

[1] These words are quite erroneously omitted by the Syrians and Arabians, by Luther, Dathe, de Wette, in their translations, and explained as a gloss by several expositors, as Schulz, Maurer, and others, also by some chronologists, for example Scaliger and Tiele (Chronol. p. 67.) The rejection of these words, which are found in the oldest versions, the LXX., where they are wanting only in the *edit. Complut*, and the Chald. is as arbitrary as the supplement, provided by Kimchi, of מֵת, "when Jehoshaphat was dead." Comp. J. Meyer, *annotat. ad Seder Olam*, p. 196 f.

[2] "In Jehoram's reign falls the building of Carthage; Dido, her husband Sichaeus, her brother Pygmalion, king of Tyre (*scelere ante alios immanior omnes.*) This synchronism of the history of Tyre is here not unimportant; Tyrian, Israelitish, Jewish history is here connected together. The daughter of Jezebel, a Tyrian princess, was Ahab's wife, and again her daughter Athaliah was Jehoram's wife, and after his death, murderer of the heirs of the throne and usurper of it. By marriage, Tyre brought its then prevalent spirit, and a vast amount of evil, into the two Israelitish kingdoms." J. D. Mich. on v. 24.

Judah (com. iii. 9; 1 Ki. xxii. 48), revolted from Judah, and elected for itself an independent king. Jehoram attempted indeed to reduce the rebels, but without effect. Of his expedition against Edom our books, as 2 Chr. xxi. 9 f. contain only the following brief notice: "And Jehoram went over to Zair with all his chariots, and he rose by night, slew the Edomites who compassed him, and the captains of his chariots, and the people fled to their tents, and Edom revolted from the supremacy of Judah," according to which we must, with most interpreters, suppose the process of affairs to have been thus: Jehoram with his army advanced as far as Zair, a city of Idumaea[1] not otherwise known, but was here surrounded by the Edomites, and slew, indeed, in a night attack the Edomite host that encompassed him, so that he extricated himself, but was compelled to abandon the subjugation of Edom, and retreated with his army to Judaea. סְבִיב (v. 21) is a later orthography for סוֹבֵב 2 Chr. xxi. 9. At that time Libnah also revolted from Judah (Jos. xv. 42),[2] situated according to Eusebius in the district of Eleutheropolis, of which no trace has yet been discovered. See v. Raum. Pal. p. 207, Winer's R.W. ii. p. 32, and Rob. Pal. ii. p. 654.

Vv. 23, 24. Jehoram died of a horrible disease, in which his bowels fell out, and was buried, indeed, with his fathers in the city of David, but not in the royal burial place, nor with the funeral solemnities performed to his father, 2 Chr. xxi. 18 ff. He was succeeded on the throne by his youngest son Ahaziah or Jehoahaz, as the older ones had been taken captive and put to death by the Arabs, 2 Chr. xxi. 16, xxii. 1.

Vv. 25—29. *Reign of Ahaziah*; comp. 2 Chr. xxii. 1—6. If Ahaziah ascended the throne in the twenty-second year of his

[1] Movers (krit. Unters. p. 218) identifies Zair with Zoar, but without any ground. From the place being totally unknown צְעִירָה, 2 Chr. xxi. 9, is omitted, and instead of it is made the addition of עִם־שָׂרָיו explaining the narrative, which can scarcely, with Dahler (*de libr. Paralip.* p. 107) be explained as a mere error of transcription.

[2] This revolt took place probably on the invasion of the Philistines (2 Chr. xxi. 16 f.) and continued till Uzziah again conquered the Philistines, 2 Chr. xxvi. 6 f. For according to xix. 8, xxiii. 31, xxiv. Libnah, at least from the time of Hezekiah, again belonged to the kingdom of Judah.

life,[1] and his father became king in his thirty-second year and reigned eight years (v. 17), he must have been born in his father's nineteenth year. Hence it might seem strange that he had elder brothers; but in the East they marry early, and royal princes had, besides the wife of the first rank, usually concubines as is expressly stated of Jehoram, 2 Chr. xxi. 17, he might therefore, in the nineteenth year of his age, very well have several sons. —V. 25 f. Ahaziah reigned as his father in the spirit of the house of Ahab, as he consulted with his mother the idolatrous Sultana walidé Athaliah, 2 Chr. xxii. 2 f.—Athaliah is called, v. 26, 2 Chr. xxii. 2, daughter of Omri, that is, grand-daughter; for according to v. 18 she was the daughter of Ahab, and was thereby indicated as the one who represented the spirit of the house of Omri, that brought so much evil on Israel and Judah, even till its extirpation in Judah.—V. 28 f. The war against the Syrians at Ramoth Gilead, in which Ahab met with his death (1 Ki. xxiii.), was in the Divine disposal to furnish the occasion for the extirpation of the whole dynasty of Omri. Ahab's son, Jehoram, undertook, in conjunction with Ahaziah of Judah, a new expedition against Ramoth[2] and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds. Thither came his nephew Ahaziah to visit his sick uncle, and there found his death along with him; comp. ix. 27; 2 Chr. xxii. 7—9.—רָמָה (v. 29) is equal to רָמֹת גִּלְעָד, see above p. 50.

[1] The number "forty-two years," in 2 Chr. xxii. 2, rests upon an obvious error of transcription, as many older expositors and chronologists have observed. The various attempts of the ancients to maintain the correctness of this number and bring it into harmony with our passage may be found collected and estimated in *J. Marckii sylloge dissert. philol. theol.* (1717) *exerc.* xviii. p. 620 ff.

[2] As Ahab's attempt to reconquer Ramoth was unsuccessful (1 Ki. xxii. 36), yet according to 2 Ki. ix. 14 this city was in the hands of the Israelites, they can have recovered it either only after that disgraceful flight of the Syrians from Samaria (vii.), or only in this war. In the latter case we must assume that in the combat about the city Jehoram was wounded, but yet the city was taken by his army.

# CHAPTER IX.

JEHU IS ANOINTED KING BY ELISHA, VV. 1—10; CONSPIRES AGAINST JORAM, VV. 11—16; AND SLAYS JORAM KING OF ISRAEL, AHAZIAH KING OF JUDAH AND QUEEN JEZEBEL, VV. 17—37.

Vv. 1—10. While the host of Israel was encamped at Ramoth, Elisha executed the last of the commissions which Elijah had received in Horeb (1 Ki. xix. 16), since he sent a scholar of the prophets thither to the camp to anoint Jehu, the captain of the host, king, to announce to him the sovereignty over Israel in the name of the Lord and to charge him with the extirpation of Ahab's house. V. 1. פַּךְ שֶׁמֶן a flask of oil; occurring besides here only in 1 Sam. x. 1, from פָּכָה to trickle (said of the slow flowing of a little water), Ezek. xlvii. 2.—מִתּוֹךְ אֶחָיו (v. 2) from the midst of his brethren, that is, of his comrades at arms. As to חֶדֶר בְּחֶדֶר see on 1 Ki. xx.—V. 3. מֶלֶךְ אֶל יִשְׂרָאֵל king for Israel; אֶל does not stand for עַל.—"And then open the door, and flee and tarry not." Elisha gives him this command scarcely, *ne pluribus ille negotiis se immisceret aut finem rei observaret* (Seb. Schm.), but ἵνα μὴ συλληφθεὶς κινδυνεύσῃ (Theod.), or *ne caperetur ab iis, qui familiae Ahabi etiammun fidi erant* (Cler.) V. 4. הַנַּעַר הַנָּבִיא has in negligent speech the article before the *nom. regens*. To regard הַנָּבִיא as in apposition with הַנַּעַר, with L. de Dieu and others, is inadmissible, because the two words together are in apposition with the preceding הַנַּעַר. On v. 7 comp. 1 Ki. xviii. 4, xix. 10; on vv. 8—10 comp. xxi. 21—23.

Vv. 11—16. When, after the departure of the scholar of the prophets, Jehu returned to his comrades, they asked the reason why the scholar of the prophets had come to him. Jehu at first answered evasively; but when they gave no credit to this answer, he communicated to them his nomination to be king; whereupon they forthwith proclaimed him king and went with him to Jezreel, after Jehu had first taken the precaution, that

no fugitive from the city bore the intelligence of his conspiracy against Joram before him to Jezreel.—V. 11. הֲשָׁלוֹם וגו׳ "Is it peace (welfare)? Wherefore came this mad man to thee?" that is, is all well? Has this crazy fellow not brought thee some ill news? מְשֻׁגָּע, *amens, vesanus*. Thus Jehu's companions at arms contemptuously designate the prophet, as even in our days not seldom those, who regardlessly confess their faith before the world, are derided by the unbelieving as crazy heads.[1] "Ye know the man and his speech," that is, *nostis eum insanum esse ac proinde insana locutum, ideoque non credenda nec a me narranda*. C. a Lap.[2]—שֶׁקֶר that is, thou speakest not the truth. V. 13. "Then they hastily took every man his garment, and put it under him on the steps, and blew with the trumpet," etc.[3] The garments, which consisted only of a large piece of cloth (see on 1 Ki. xi. 29), were spread on the floor instead of a carpet as a sign of homage (Mat. xxi. 7), with which also the heathen distinguished highly honoured generals and monarchs; see Wetstein Nov. Test. ad Mat. xxi. 7. On the blowing of the trumpet comp. above p. 12. אֶל גֶּרֶם הַמַּעֲלוֹת the old interpreters only have succeeded in explaining; LXX. ἐπὶ τῷ Γαρὲμ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν; Chald. לְדַרְגַּ שָׁעַיָּא *ad gradum horarum*, which Kimchi and Jarchi explain by *lapidem in quo signatae sunt lineae horariae;* Syr. ܥܠ ܡܘܬܒܐ ܕܕܪ̈ܓܐ *super sedem graduum*; Arab. علي درج المطلع *super gradus loci quo ascenditur*. גֶּרֶם bone,

[1] We may not therefore, with Seb. Münster, Vatabl., Grotius, Hengstenb. Christol. i. 1, p. 294 f., and others, make use of this expression to prove that the state of prophetic inspiration was ecstatic, combined with the violent suppression of the intelligent consciousness and of the whole individual life, like the *furor* of the sibyls and heathen soothsayers. See against this view Hävernick's Einl. ii. 2, p. 35 ff.

[2] Seb. Schm., Joh. H. and J. D. Mich., Deres., and others, incorrectly explain these words, "ye may have sent him yourselves to make a jest."

[3] Hence we see again, how Jehu and his companions of their own will make use of the word uttered by the prophet for rebellion and conspiracy, to which they were not authorized by God; for the prophet had not commanded rebellion, as J. D. Mich. on v. 3 ff. asserts, according to his anti-biblical political views. Comp. what was remarked on this point on 1 Ki. xi. 26 ff.

Gen. xlix. 14; Prov. xvii. 22, etc., denotes here as עֶצֶם frequently *substantiam rei, rem ipsam.* עַל גֶּרֶם הַמַּ׳ *super ipsosmet gradus.* So Kimchi in the *lib. rad. L. de Dieu ad h. l.*, Winer *(lex.)* and others. On the contrary Gesen. *(thes.* i. 303) has given the preference to the other explanation of גרם, also proposed by *L. de Dieu*, from the Arabic جَرْم *sectio, pars; super aliquem e gradibus.* In the context this would also suit very well, but the analogy of גרם with עצם, as well as in general the late speech usage of our books, decides rather for the first meaning, having in its favour the Aramaic usage, which suits still better. The sense is, without seeking a place suitable for the erection of a throne, they placed their garments upon the steps themselves or the stairs of the house in which they were actually assembled, and set Jehu upon them to proclaim him king. V. 14. הָיָה שֹׁמֵר בר׳ "was keeping watch in Ramoth;" hence Ramoth was now in possession of the Israelites, but was threatened by the Syrians.—V. 15. לַגִּיד for לְהַגִּיד, comp. Ew. Gr. § 463.

Vv. 17—21. Two horsemen sent, at the report of the watchman on the tower at Jezreel by the king, one after another, to meet the approaching troop, attach themselves to Jehu's train; whereupon at last, when the watchman from the tower thought he had recognized on the nearer approach of the company the driving of Jehu, king Joram and Ahaziah mounted their chariots to advance towards him, and encountered Jehu in the field of Naboth the Jezreelite.—The second שִׁפְעַת (v. 17) is a later form for שִׁפְעָה, comp. Ges. Lehrgeb. p. 467 and Ew. Gr. § 365. V. 18. מַה־לְּךָ וּלְשָׁלוֹם "What hast thou to do with peace," that is, to concern thyself about it? *Nihil hoc te adtinet, sitne pax nec ne.* J. H. Mich. סֹב אֶל־אַחֲרָי "turn thee behind me (after me)." V. 20. "The driving is like the driving of Jehu, for he driveth like a madman." בְּשִׁגָּעוֹן *in insania*, that is, in fact *cum præcipitatione* (Vatabl.) Falsely the LXX.: ἐν παραλλαγῇ and Chald. בְּנִיחַ *in quiete = pedetentim.* חֶלְקַת נָבוֹת (v. 21) is the כֶּרֶם נָבוֹת mentioned 1 Ki. xxi.

Vv. 22—26. To Joram's question, הֲשָׁלוֹם יֵהוּא, Jehu

answered, "What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her many witchcrafts continue?" From this answer discovering the treason, Joram turned and fled, but was pierced through by an arrow from Jehu, so that he sank down in the chariot, and his body was then cast by Jehu's adjutant in the field of Naboth, that the word of the Lord spoken by Elijah concerning the house of Ahab (1 Ki. xxi. 19 ff.) might be fulfilled. עַד־זְנוּנֵי וגו' "during the whoredoms," that is, so long as they endure. עַד denotes continuance, and is in this sense elsewhere connected with the infinitive, Judg. iii. 26. זְנוּנִים spiritual whoredom, that is, idolatry, with which כְּשָׁפִים properly *incantationes magicae*, then witchcrafts were in general (comp. Is. xlvii. 9) connected, comp. Deut. xviii. 10 ff. V. 23. On יַהֲפֹךְ יָדָיו see on 1 Ki. xxii. 24. מִרְמָה means also here only fraud. We are defrauded, that is, in fact, betrayed. V. 24. מִלֵּא יָדוֹ בַקֶּשֶׁת means neither, *implevit manu arcum*, nor *manus Jehu implevit arcum* (Schultens *Op. min.* p. 176), but, Jehu filled his hand with the bow, that is, seized the bow.[1] בֵּין זְרֹעָיו between his arms, that is, in the back between the shoulders. כִּי זְכֹר אֲנִי וגו' "For remember me and thee, the riders . . . ," that is, recollect how we, I and thou, rode (or drove) after Ahab his father. The אֵת before רכבים is not the preposition *cum* (*L. de Dieu*), but *nota accusat* depending on זכר, as the pronouns אֲנִי וְאַתָּה, which are put in looser connexion for אֹתִי וְאוֹתְךָ. רֹכְבִים צְמָדִים most explain: *equitantes per paria, bini* (Gesen.); though we might understand it also with Kimchi and Bochart (*hieroz.* i. p. 979) *de binis, qui in eodem curru vehuntur.* נָשָׂא מַשָּׂא עַל פל' means not to lay a burden on any one (Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 102 ff., and comm. on Pss. i. 300 f.), but, to pronounce sentence on any one, comp. Delitszch on Hab. i. 1.—V. 26. אִם לֹא is a form of oath; if not = truly. Jehu quotes the Divine

[1] The Arabic expression أصاا في القوس adduced by A. Schultens *l. c. p.* 176 and 555 does not apply here, because it originates from the complete phrase أصاا النزع في القوس.

sentence of Elijah on Ahab (1 Ki. xxi. 19) freely as to the words, but correctly enough as to the sense, which in consequence of the repentance of Ahab was to be fulfilled only in his son (comp. the remarks on 1 Ki. xxi. 19) and was now executed by Jehu on Joram.—וְאֶת־דְּמֵי בָנָיו. In the account of the stoning of Naboth (1 Ki. xxi. 13 ff.), the stoning of his sons certainly is not expressly mentioned, but it follows from the fact that Naboth's goods were confiscated (see on 1 Ki. xxi. 14 ff.) and was not particularly mentioned, "because the thing was so usual, that the historian might omit it as understood of itself." Mich. Mos. R.V. § 229, comp. also on xiv. 5 f.

Vv. 27—29. When Ahaziah saw this, he wished to escape, but was overtaken by Jehu in Ibleam and mortally wounded, so that fleeing farther he died at Megiddo, and as a corpse was carried by his servants to Jerusalem and buried there. In 2 Chr. xxii. 9 this account is much curtailed, whereby it is made to appear as if Ahaziah had died in Samaria, an apparent contradiction, which Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 92) wishes to remove unnecessarily by violent alterations of the text,[1] whereas the two accounts simply harmonize as I have stated according to the older expositors in my apolog. Vers. p. 289. Ahaziah namely fled first by the way to the garden house and escaped to Samaria, but was here, where he had hid himself, taken by Jehu's men who followed him, brought to Jehu, who was still near or in Jezreel, and at his command slain at the hill Gur beside Ibleam in his chariot, that is, mortally wounded with an arrow, so that he again fleeing expired at Megiddo. Comp. *Buddei. hist. eccl.* ii. p. 388. To the command, "Smite him in the chariot at the hill Gur by Ibleam" must be supplied the execution of the command, as this is often omitted in the Hebrew. This method is simpler than to assume with de Wette and Maurer that וַיַּכֻּהוּ has fallen out after הַכֻּהוּ. Ibleam lay, according to y. 27 and Judg. i. 27,

[1] But instead of removing the apparent contradiction, Movers has, by the proposed alteration of וַיְבִאֻהוּ אֶל־יה׳ וגו׳ into וַיָּבֹא הוּא לִיהוּדָה, he came to Judah, where he was slain," not only introduced an actual and unaccountable contradiction into the text, but also committed the geographical offence of regarding the town of Megiddo (see above, p. 48) situated in the plain of Esdraelon, as belonging to the kingdom of Judah.

near Megiddo in the tribe of Issachar (Jos. xvii. 11); as the place has not been discovered, nothing can be determined about the hill Gur.—V. 49 is a repetition of viii. 25. The difference "in the twelfth year of Joram," viii. 45, and "in the eleventh year of Joram" here is most simply explained by a different computation of the beginning of the years of his reign.

V. 30—37. Finally, the Divine judgment falls also upon the profligate Jezebel. When Jehu came to Jezreel, she adorned herself with paint and head-gear, to impose on him as queen, or at least to die as queen, but was at his command thrown out of the window, trampled upon by Jehu's horses, and instantly devoured by dogs, so that shortly after, when Jehu wished to have her buried, some remains only of her body, the skull, feet, and hands, were found.—"And she put her eyes in lead-glance," that is, painted them with lead-glance. פּוּךְ a favourite eye-pigment of the Eastern women to this day, composed of a mixture of burnt or pulverised antimony (*Stibium, Antimonium, Arab.* كُحْل or of lead-ore similar to antimony and zinc, which was made up with some liquid, usually oil, and applied with a paint-brush to the eye-lids, whereby they received a dark border, and the eye appeared much brighter and larger;[1] comp. Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iv. p. 268 ff., Winer R.W. ii. p. 492, and the documents there quoted.—V. 31. הֲשָׁלוֹם זִמְרִי "Is it peace, Zimri, the murderer of his master?" Against this Maurer has objected, *quis credat, Isabelam regem interrogasse; num pacato, benevolo animo venisset, eodemque temporis momento regis interfectorem appellasse?* But this objection is of no importance, and should not have induced de Wette in the third edition of his Old Testament to confound the correct rendering with the false one of Maurer, "was it well with Zimri, the murderer of his master?"

[1] Accordingly the phrase, to put the eyes in lead-glance, for, to paint them, is very expressive of the reality, and there is no need of the explanation of וַתָּשֶׂם proposed by A. Schultens (Op. min. p. 177) from the Arabic وَشَمَ to tattoo, which does not correspond with the reality, since the eyelids were not scratched to introduce the paint, and is not in the remotest sense demanded by Jer. iv. 30, as the prophet designedly used the striking expression, to rend קָרַע the eyes with paint.

*(an incolumis* fuit *Simri etc.)* If the words had this sense, הָיָה would not be wanting. In and of itself also it cannot be understood otherwise than in v. 22. But the difficulty raised against the only admissible rendering of the words is founded upon the false supposition, that Jezebel painted and attired herself, to corrupt Jehu by her charms, which was certainly entertained by Ephraim Syr. The true reason is found in the *Critt. ss.* by Münster and Clarius: *Adhibuit autem fucum mulier ista detestabilis faciei suae, non quod acceptior esset Jehu caperetque ipsum oculis suis, sed ut gravitatem regiam prae se ferret et illum a suo conatu terreret. Unde et superbo animo locuta est ad illum; nescis quod non bene cesserit Zimri, qui percussit Baasa dominum suum, sicut et tu tuum interfecisti.* She calls Jehu a second Zimri, in order to point indirectly to the fate which awaited him for the murder of his king, 1 Ki, xvi. 10—18.—V. 32. מִי אִתִּי מִי, "who is (holds) with me, who?"—V. 33. On the form רֵּן see Ew. Gr. p. 161.—וַיִּרְמְסֶנָּה *et conculcavit eam Jehu equis super eam actis.* Schulz.—אֶת־הָאֲרוּרָה הַזֹּאת, that is, her upon whom the Divine curse has fallen. On v. 36 f. comp. 1 Ki. xxi. 23. What Jehu here quotes as the prediction of Elijah stands not all literally in that passage, and it is not necessary to suppose with many expositors, that the sentence of the prophet is there given in an abbreviated form, as it is much more obvious to assume, that Jehu did not confine himself strictly to the words of Elijah, but freely expanded them according to the sense. This free expansion of the prediction explains also חֵלֶק for חֵל. The form וְהָיְתָ is the oldest form of the 3. p. s. f., which has been preserved in the Hebrew only in a few places (Lev. xxv. 21, xxvi. 34; Jer. xiii. 19), comp. Ew. Gr. § 286, and is usually called a Syriasm, see Gesen. Hebr. Gr. § 74. Remark 1.—"That they cannot say, This is Jezebel," they can no longer recognize her.

## CHAPTER X. vv. 1—27.

EXTIRPATION OF THE REMAINING SONS OF AHAB, VV. 1—11; OF THE BRETHREN OF AHAZIAH OF JUDAH, VV. 12—14; AND OF THE PROPHETS AND PRIESTS OF BAAL, VV. 15—27.

Vv. 1—5. In order to extirpate the seventy descendants of Ahab residing in Samaria, Jehu sent letters thither to the rulers of Jezreel, the elders and guardians of the royal princes, with the challenge to appoint one of the sons of their master king. This summons was an artifice, by which he only wished to sound the disposition of the grandees of the kingdom, who stood nearest to the royal house, because he did not dare, without having ascertained this, with the obviously small number of his followers to march to Samaria, the capital, in order to exterminate the remaining members of the royal house of Ahab. The artifice succeeded. The nobles in Samaria were in great terror, partly, from his power, as he had the army on his side, partly also because they might recognize in him, who had slain the two kings, the divinely appointed avenger and executor of the curse pronounced upon the house of Ahab, and therefore declared by a deputation sent to him, their submission to his orders.—V. 1. The seventy בָּנִים of Ahab in Samaria are not strictly sons only, but, as guardians are still spoken of, and Ahab was now thirteen or fourteen years dead, the whole posterity of Ahab, consisting of sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons, comp. v. 13.—שָׂרֵי יִזְרְעֶאל the nobles, or most distinguished men of Jezreel. The old translators stumbled at Jezreel, so that the LXX. put Σαμαρείας, the *Vulg. civitatis* in its place, many of the moderns, as Cler., Calm., Mich., wished to change Jezreel into Israel, while others supposed that the chief men of Jezreel, after Joram was put to death, had fled from Jehu to Samaria. But neither alterations of the text, nor the other improbable suppositions are necessary; but the supreme court-officials of the royal house of Ahab are called the chief men of Jezreel, because Ahab often resided there, and many of them might actually belong to the men of rank in

Jezreel, but were at that time in Samaria.[1] הָאֹמְנִים אַחְאָב are the guardians and educators of the royal princes of Ahab. V. 2. On וְעַתָּה comp. on v. 6. From the expression, "with you are the sons of your master," that is, Joram, we perceive, that among the sons of Ahab, his grandsons, also the sons of Joram, are included.—The terms of the letter, "ye have all in your hands, the king's sons, chariots and horses, a fenced city and armour; Look even out the best and meetest of your master's sons," etc., are evidently ironical. הִלָּחֵם עַל־בֵּית fight for the house, as Judg. ix. 17.—V. 5. אֲשֶׁר־עַל־הַבַּיִת prefect of the palace, see above p. 44. אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעִיר the governor of the town = שַׂר הָעִיר 1 Ki. 26.

Vv. 6—11. After the nobles in Samaria had signified to Jehu their readiness to submit to him, he wrote them an order to slay the seventy descendants of Ahab, and send their heads on the following day to Jezreel, which they also compliantly did." אֶת־גְּדֹלֵי ה׳ (v. 6) is not the nominative, so that אֶת *ex sequiori Hebraismo* stands before the nominative (Maur.), but אֶת is a preposition; "the king's sons, seventy persons, were with the great men of the city, who brought them up." Jehu then caused the heads cut off to be laid in two heaps before the city gate, in Jezreel, and on the following morning, in sight of them, said to the assembled people, "Ye are righteous, I conspired against my master and slew him, but who slew all these? (v. 9.) Know now, that nothing of the word of the Lord falls to the earth (remains unfulfilled), which he spake concerning the house of Ahab, and Jehovah has done that which he spake by his servant Elijah" (v. 10.) The sense of these words is differently apprehended. Cler., Dathe, Schulz, Maur., and others find in v. 9, an ironical expression of Jehu, *ut ostendat, sibi soli non esse exprobrandum, quod in Achabi familiam rebellasset, cum primores ipsi Israelitarum omnes ejus filios interemissent.* But although

[1] From the circumstance, that in v. 5 instead of the chief men of Jezreel (שָׂרֵי יז׳) "he that was over the house," and "he that was over the city," are named, de Wette infers, that perhaps both residenees had only one commandant of the city and one steward of the household.

Jehu wishes in some measure to justify his conspiracy, yet his words, ye are righteous, are neither ironical, nor can they be taken with J. H. Mich. and others, as a question, are ye righteous? as if Jehu had thereby wished to represent the people as accomplices in his conspiracy. The words contain a cunning device, inasmuch as Jehu not only conceals from the people that Ahab's descendants in Samaria were beheaded by his order, but summons them, as righteous, to judge impartially, whether his conspiracy and slaughter of the king, which he openly confesses, are to be regarded as a punishable offence, and to discern from the circumstance that the sons also of Ahab were slain ostensibly without his assistance, that he had done nothing but co-operate on his part in the execution of the judgment inflicted by the Lord on the house of Ahab. V. 11. The effect of this speech was, that the people quietly looked on, while Jehu put to death also all the more distant relatives and still remaining influential friends and followers of the dynasty of Ahab in Jezreel. כֹּהֲנָיו his priests are probably court priests, such as the heathen kings had, not secular advisers, as several expositors think.

Vv. 12—14. When Jehu on this went to Samaria, by the way he met at the binding-house of the shepherds the relatives of Ahaziah, king of Judah, who having no intelligence of the preceding events, wished to go to Samaria to visit the princes of Israel, and caused them all, forty-two men, to be taken alive and slain at the cistern of the binding-house, in order probably to prevent the royal house of Judah, with the certainly not inconsiderable party of adherents to the royal house of Ahab in Samaria, from conspiring against him. בֵּית עֵקֶד הָרֹעִים (*Βαιθακάθ* LXX.) Jarchi, with the Chald., explains בֵּית כְּנִישַׁת רָעֲיָא *locus conventus pastorum*, according to which Gesen. *thes.* i. 195 (with reference to the Arabic عَقْد, *pagus, prædium*) *domus prædii pastorum*; but has عَقْد actually this signification? Freytag does not recognize it in his *lex. s. v.* The older interpreters generally give, *tonstrinae pastorum, i.e., domus ubi pastores ligabant oves quando eas tondebant.* Eusebius says, *Βαιθακάθ* . . *κώμη ἀπέχουσα τῆς λεγεῶνος* (Megiddo) *σημείοις ιέ ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ πεδίῳ*. Here certainty cannot be obtained.—אֲחֵי אֲחַזְיָהוּ, for

which stands 2 Chr. xxii. 8, בְּנֵי אֲחֵי אח׳, nephews of Ahaziah, are not full brothers of Ahaziah, as these were carried away by the Arabians and slain before he ascended the throne (2 Chr. xxi. 17, xxii. 1), but partly step-brothers, that is, sons of Jehoram by his concubines or wives of the second rank, partly brothers' sons, nephews, and cousins, in general blood relations of Ahaziah. When could Jehoram, who died when forty years old (2 Ki. viii. 17), have begotten forty-two sons? Comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 414.—לְשָׁלוֹם *ad salutandum*, briefly for לִרְאוֹת שָׁלוֹם to enquire after the health, that is, to visit. בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ are the sons of Joram, בְּנֵי הַגְּבִירָה, the sons of the queen mother (regent, comp. on 1 Ki. xv. 10—13, xix. 1) Jezebel, thus the brothers of Joram; both together are, v. 1, included under the בָּנִים of Ahab.

Vv. 15—17. By the way Jehu meets also with Jehonadab the Rechabite, and after he had satisfied himself of his upright intentions, caused him to mount his chariot and go with him to Samaria, that he might witness his zeal for the Lord, when he on his arrival cut off all the surviving members and adherents of the house of Ahab. Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, is to be regarded as the patriarch of the Rechabites, since he prescribed to his sons and descendants for all time to come the rule, to pursue the simple nomadic life, namely, to dwell in tents, to till no ground, and to abstain from wine, which rule they held so sacred, that the prophet Jeremiah set them forth as an example to his contemporaries who transgressed the Divine law without any fear, and was able to promise to them, the Rechabites, in return for their faithful adherence to their father's injunction, exemption from the calamities of the Chaldee invasion (Jer. xxxv.) His father Rechab, from whom Jehonadab's posterity derived their family name, was the son of Hemath, and belonged to the tribe of the Kinites or Kenites (1 Chr. ii. 55), to which also Moses' father-in-law, Hobab, belonged (Num. x. 29), so that the Rechabites probably descended from Hobab, as the Kenites, the children of Hobab, went with Israel from the desert of Arabia to Palestine, and there had continued their nomadic life. Judg. i. 16, iv. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 6. Compare Witsius *Miscell. ss.* ii. p. 223 ff., Carpzov, *appar. crit.* p. 148. This Jehonadab was accordingly a distinguished man on account of the strictness of his

life, and Jehu appears to have treated him in so friendly a manner on account of the great reputation which he enjoyed, not merely in his own tribe, but generally in Israel, in order through his friendship to be more exculpated in the eyes of the people with regard to his conspiracy.[1] הֲיֵשׁ אֶת־לְבָבְךָ וגו׳, "Is thine heart honest as my heart towards thy heart?" The use of the אֶת before the subject belongs to the grammatical inaccuracies of the later language, comp. Ew. krit. Gr. p. 597. וָיֵשׁ, and if it is (honest), give thine hand, *in fidei confirmationem et concordiae signum.* Seb. Schm.—V. 17. "All that remained to Ahab," that is, all the remaining members and adherents of the dynasty of Ahab. On the form עַד הִשְׁמִיד, see Ew. Kr. Gr. p. 649 not.

Vv. 18 – 27. By an artifice Jehu slew all the prophets, priests, and servants of Baal, since under the pretext that he wished to serve Baal still more than Ahab, he ordered a great sacrifice to this god, summoned to it all the worshippers of Baal in the whole land, surrounded the temple of Baal in which they were assembled with eighty men of his guards, and through them had the collected worshippers of Baal put to the sword after the offering was completed. *Quod ad factum, sacerdotum Baaliticorum interfectionem, non male fecit pro statu et ordinationibus Veteris Test. At quod ad circumstantiam facti, dum mentitur cultum Baaliticum excusatum nolumus.* Seb. Schm. In an objective light the slaying of the servants of Baal was quite in harmony with the law and quite legitimate on theocratic ground; but the subjective motive, which irrespective of the artifice influenced Jehu, was thoroughly selfish. As the priests and prophets of Baal in the land of Israel, with all their interests and their whole existence, were bound up with the dynasty of Ahab, they might be dangerous to Jehu, if he did not from political considerations earnestly promote their objects, whereas by their extermination he might hope to bring to his side the whole of the certainly very

[1] According to Corn. a Lap., he took him into his chariot, *ut auctoritatem sibi apud Samaritas nomenque probitatis conciliaret per Jonadabum sibi socium, quem omnes habebant pro viro integro et sancto, ut hac ratione facilius perageret caedem Baalitarum, quam moliebatur, nec aliquis ei resistere auderet.*

numerous party of the earlier legally constituted worship of Jehovah in Israel, and thereby give stability to his throne. But that Jehu used religion only as a means to an end is proved by the circumstance that he continued the worship of the calves (v. 29.) V. 20. קַדְּשׁוּ עֲצָרָה "consecrate a solemn assembly," that is, proclaim in the land a holy convocation for Baal, comp. Is. i. 13; Jo. i. 14; Am. v. 21. עֲצָרָה = עֲצֶרֶת is virtually equivalent to מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ Lev. xxiii. 36, comp. Num. xxix. 35; Deut. xvi. 8, and denotes originally the solemnity, with which the feast of tabernacles was closed on the eighth, and the passover on the seventh day, and not only the holy public convocation on this day, on which no work was to be done, but also the day itself as the close of the festival, comp. Bähr's Symbol. ii. p. 618 f. וַיִּקְרָאוּ "And they proclaimed" the solemn convocation. V. 21. פֶּה לָפֶה "from one end to the other," xxi. 16. This import of the phrase is not to be derived with Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 1088) from פֶּה = פֵּאָה *latus*, but from פֶּה mouth, orifice, from the upper rim of a vessel. *Metaphora sumta a vasis humore aliquo plenis.* Vatabl.—V. 22. The ἅπαξ λεγ. מֶלְתָּחָה *vestiarium*, wardrobe, finds its explication in the Ethiopic, see Ges. *thes.* ii. 764. אֲשֶׁר עַל־הַמֶּ׳ the Arab. correctly renders صاحب الكسوة *praefectus vestium.* Like the priests of almost all nations, the priests of Baal also had their particular sacred robes, made probably of white byssus,[1] which they put on only when officiating, and which were kept in a particular wardrobe in the temple, under the care of a master of the wardrobe.[2] V. 24.

[1] This may be inferred partly from the dress of the priests of the Gadetanic Hercules in Sil. Ital. iii. 23.

. . . . *Nec discolor ulli*
*Ante aras cultus: velantur corpora lino,*
*Et Pelusiaco praefulget stamine vertex*—

partly from this, that the priests of most nations wore white robes of office. Comp. Saubertus, *de sacrif.* c. 9, Spencer, *de leg. Hebr. ritual.* *l.* iii. *c.* 5, p. 682 f., Braun, *de vestit. sacerdot.* i. *c.* i. p. 9 and *c.* ix. p. 179 ff. and Bähr, Symbol. ii. p. 87 ff.

[2] The holy garments also of the priests of Israel were kept in the temple at Jerusalem, comp. Braun *l. c.* ii. *c.* 26, p. 675 ff. Many interpreters, therefore, even Gesenius, understand מֶלְתָּחָה incorrectly

נַפְשׁוֹ תַּחַת נַפְשׁוֹ "his soul hold for his soul." That is, if one of the priests of Baal escape, he who has let him escape is to hold his own life for his, that is, to give his own life instead of his, 1 Ki. xx. 39. V. 25. שָׁלִשִׁים the royal satellites see on 1 Ki. ix. 22.—וַיַּשְׁלִכוּ they cast out, namely, the slain from the temple. עִיר בֵּית־הַבַּעַל is usually explained, city of the temple of Baal, that is, the quarter in which the temple was. So the old translators, de Wette, Maurer, and others. But the satellites of Jehu were already in the temple of Baal; how could they, therefore, after they had slain the priests assembled there, first go into the quarter where the temple was? For to assume two temples of Baal in Samaria is quite improbable, as in 1 Ki. xvi. 32 only the building of a house of Baal is mentioned, and here also the destruction of only one is spoken of, while Jehu entirely exterminated Baal out of Israel.[1] Seb. Schm. seems to have discovered the right explanation. *Puto templum Baalis magnifice fuisse extructum instar arcis alicujus: foris autem fuisse atrium, in quo sacrificia peracta. In hoc itaque atrio sacerdotes occisi sunt, et ex atrio irruperunt satellites Jehu in ipsam arcem templi et ejecerunt statuas Baalis.* For although the etymology of the word עִיר is quite uncertain, yet there can be no doubt of this, that it means primarily a place enclosed with walls, because by the surrounding wall alone was the city originally distinguished from the village or town, wherewith the idea of a castle, or more correctly perhaps an enclosed space, was closely connected. עִיר בֵּית is the

of the royal wardrobe; still more erroneous is the opinion of Dereser, that Jehu gave the priests of Baal a caftan out of it, to make them more easily distinguishable by the guards who were to slay them, or as Cleric. thinks, *ut fidem faceret omnibus, nullam fraudem subesse alliceretque omnes si qui adhuc laterent.* Both were unnecessary; the first, because Jehu (v. 23) caused the assembly to be searched, whether any worshipper of Jehovah was in it; the second, because the sacrifice proposed must have obviated all suspicion of treachery.

[1] Still more arbitrary is it, with Vatabl., *Lud. de Dieu ad h. l.* and Cler. to understand by עיר בית הבעל *urbem vicinam Samariae, ubi templum peculiare habebat Baal*, or with Calmet a town with the surname *templum Baalis*, or with J. D. Mich. (*Supplem. ad lexx. Hebr.* p. 1090 to explain it by غَيْر *alius*. Neither has עִיר the meaning *pit*, which Schulz, Dereser, and others give the word.

inner sanctuary of the temple, as xx. 4, הָעִיר הַתִּיכֹנָה the inner part of the city, where the Masoretes have explained עִיר by חָצֵר. The root is probably "עָר *circumire, circumdare, cingere*" (Fürst, *Concord.* p. 805), equivalent to חָצַר حصر *circumdedit, circumvallavit,* so that the primary meaning of עִיר is *sepimentum, munimentum, locus circumseptus munitus.* But עִיר nowhere signifies an open village or shepherd's hamlet, as Hitzig on Is. i. 8 asserts. In vv. 26 and 27 מַצְּבוֹת בֵּית הַבַּעַל are different from the מַצְּבַת הַבַּעַל; the latter is broken down, as was the house of Baal, and was consequently a conical stone dedicated to Baal, compare the remarks on 1 Ki. xiv. 23; the former are burnt, and were therefore of wood, and, according to Movers' very probable conjecture, πάρεδροι or σύμβωμοι of Baal (d. Phoniz. i. p. 674.) To cover the demolished temple with perpetual infamy they made it into privies לְמַחֲרָאוֹת, for which indecent expression the Masor. substituted מוֹצָאוֹת, a mode of insult of which there are examples in other nations, comp. Ezr. vi. 11, Dan. ii. 5, and Hävern. on the passage, Lorsbach, Archiv. für morgenl. Litter. i. p. 125, and Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 279.

Vv. 28, 29. Thus Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel, but allowed the worship of the calves introduced by Jeroboam (1 Ki. xii. 28 f.) to continue.

*Third Epoch.* From the reign of Jehu in Israel and Athaliah in Judah to the fall of the kingdom of Israel in the sixth year of Hezekiah, chap. x. 30—xviii. 41.

The last verses of chap. x. and the whole of chap. xi. form the introduction to this epoch, or the transition to the last section of the second period of the history of the kings, wherein the character which the development of the theocracy bears in this whole period of 162 years is beforehand clearly discovered. The kingdom of Israel, through the great works of God which Elijah and Elisha had wrought in it, had only advanced so far as to exterminate the worship of Baal, so that in the beginning of this third epoch it has only returned again to the illegal worship of God under the symbols of the calves at Bethel and Dan. The

Lord, therefore, began now, through the Syrians, to smite it in all its borders (x. 32 f.), although Jehu was so far favoured for the destruction of Baal effected in the name of the Lord, that his posterity were to occupy the throne till the fourth generation (v. 30.) Judah had also paid with the life of its king for the worship of Baal adopted from Israel, and was to be still farther chastised through Athaliah, descended from the idolatrous Jezebel, who usurped the throne and tyrannised over the kingdom for six years, until she was overthrown by the courage of the high-priest Jehoiada, and with her not only was the worship of Baal entirely eradicated, but also a king was given to the country in the person of Joash, the son of the king that was saved, who, as long as Jehoiada was his adviser, governed the covenant people in a purely theocratic spirit (ch. xi.) His successors on the whole followed the law of the Lord, although they did not entirely suppress the worship on the high places, till Ahaz, who publicly introduced the Syrian idolatry into Jerusalem.—In the kingdom of Israel Jehu's successors all walk in the sins of Jeroboam, and have to suffer much from the Syrians, until the Lord, through Jehoash and Jeroboam II., granted them victory over these enemies. But, after the death of the latter, anarchy and repeated murders of kings unsettled the scarcely recruited monarchy. Judah, on the contrary, strengthened under Joash and Amaziah, was indeed involved by the arrogance of the latter in an unfortunately ending war with Israel, but raised to still greater external power by Uzziah and Jotham. It sank again, however, under the untheocratic sway of the idolatrous Ahaz. The confederate Syrians and Israelites invaded Judah, and Ahaz, instead of trusting in the promised help of the Lord, applied to the king of Assyria, and thus prepared the way for these conquerors of upper Asia into the holy land, in consequence of which they, in repeated invasions, conquered the kingdom of the ten tribes, brought it to an end by the taking of Samaria, carried away its inhabitants to Assyria and Media (ch. xviii.), and transplanted Babylonish colonists into the depopulated country. Not content, however, with this, the Assyrians invaded Judah also, and pressed it so hard that Ahaz was able to save his kingdom from conquest and ruin only by the payment of a heavy tribute.

## CHAPTER X. vv. 30—36.

### REIGN OF JEHU OF ISRAEL.

Vv. 30—36. For the extirpation of the idolatrous house of Ahab, Jehu is promised the possession of the throne for his sons to the fourth generation, comp. xv. 12. The Divine sentence, "Thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes, thou hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart," refers to the act as such, not to the subjective motive which may have influenced Jehu therein. This is shown at once by the contrast in v. 31, "But Jehu followed not the law of the Lord with his whole heart, he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam. Now, therefore, Hazael must exercise the office of corrector on the faithless kingdom of the ten tribes," v. 32 ff. לְקַצּוֹת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל "to cut off in Israel," that is, to rend away parts of the kingdom. Hazael seized the whole land east of the Jordan, v. 33, comp. with Num. xxxii. 33—42, and Jos. xiii. 15—32. "The whole land of Gilead," assigned to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh, included the kings of Gilead and Bashan (see above p. 53), and extended southwards to the brook Arnon, northwards to mount Hermon (Jebel esh sheik), comp. Deut. iii. 8, iv. 48, Jos. xi. 3, 17, xiii. 11, v. Raumer, Pal. p. 27, and Rob. Pal. iii. p. 625. Of Aroer on the Arnon موجب Burckh. found ruins under the name of عرعاير Araair, (see Ges. *thes.* ii. 1074) on the north bank of the Mujeb, on which comp. v. Raum. p. 73, Ges. *thes.* i. 153, and Winer R. W. p. 102 f.

## CHAPTER XI.

**ATHALIAH USURPS THE THRONE, VV. 1—3, BUT IS OVERTHROWN AND JOASH RAISED TO THE THRONE, VV. 4—20. COMP. 2 CHR. XXII. 10, XXIII. 21.**

Vv. 1—3. After the death of Ahaziah of Judah, his mother, Athaliah, (comp. on viii. 18, 26), usurped the government and destroyed all the seed royal except Joash, who was stolen by Jehosheba, his father's sister, the wife of Jehoiada, the high priest, when a little child, from the midst of the royal children, who were slain, and with his nurse was first brought into the chamber of beds and afterwards kept concealed from Athaliah six years in the residence of the high priest in the temple buildings. כָּל־זֶרַע הַמַּמְלָכָה all the seed of the kingdom, all the descendants of the royal family, who could lay claim to the throne, or all the sons of Ahaziah (v. 2.) For there were scarcely any other direct descendants of the royal house, as the elder full brothers of Ahaziah had been carried away and murdered by the Arabs, and the other near blood relations who were males, had been slain by Jehu, see on x. 13 f.—Jehosheba, the daughter of king Joram, married to Jehoida, was scarcely a full daughter of Athaliah, as this worshipper of Baal would hardly have consented to the marriage of her full daughter with the high priest, (Cler.), and she is in both narratives designated only as the daughter of Jehoram and sister of Ahaziah. She was thus begotten of Joram by a wife of the second rank. The Kethibh הַמְּמוֹתְתִים is here an adjective: "devoted to death," elsewhere a substantive, Jer. xvi. 4, and Ezek. xxviii. 8, comp. Hävern. on the passage. The Masor. therefore wished to read מוּמָתִים the *hoph.* participle, as in 2 Chr. xxii. 11. The term בַּחֲדַר הַמִּטּוֹת is to be connected with וַתִּגְנֹב, "they stole him and his nurse into the chamber of beds," for, they stole him and concealed him in the chamber of beds, till they could bring him with his nurse into their dwelling in the temple.[1] The chamber of beds is not the

[1] This *constructio prægnans* is resolved in 2 Chr. xxii. 11, by supplying וַתִּתֵּן, which, however, does not entitle us with Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 85), to amend our text after Chronicles.

dormitory of the priests and Levites in the temple courts, as many interpreters, with several Talmudists suppose, nor the chamber, *ubi liberi infantes regum cubabant* (Cler.), but a chamber in the palace, where the beds (matrasses and coverlets) were kept, for which they have a chamber in the East which is not inhabited. See Chardin in Harm. Beobacht. iii. p. 357.

Vv. 4—20. *Fall of Athaliah and elevation of Jehoash to the throne.* To this narrative is found a more copious parallel in 2 Chr. xxiii., deviating in several points. These deviations are made to be contradictions by de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 95 ff. and Einl. p. 264), and Gramb. (d. Chron. p. 135 ff., Religionsid. d. A. T. i. p. 255 ff.), and pronounced to be arbitrary changes of the writer of Chron. in favour of the Levites, in opposition to which Dahler *l. c.* p. 112 ff. endeavoured to show, that Chronicles in comparison with our narrative contains *narrationem integriorem et fide digniorem*, while Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 307 ff.) has declared all the deviations of Chronicles to be "singular mistakes" of the writer. In accordance with his erroneous view of the sources of Chronicles he could come to no other conclusion.[1] Yet even Dahler's defence of Chronicles is unsatisfactory in this respect, that it is made at the expense of the credibility of our narrative. The harmony of the two narratives Hertz i. p. q. p. 51 ff. has rightly asserted, but has done anything rather than proved, inasmuch as he has brought forward much that is untenable and erroneous along with several just remarks. The two narratives are short abstracts from a common larger source with diverse aim and plan, and all the differences and apparent contradictions are explained, partly by the incompleteness and brevity of the two abstracts, partly by the different points of

[1] The mode in which Mov. treats this history, in which he has, according to the just remark of Hävernick, rather "confused than illustrated the two narratives," affords astriking proof of the incorrectness of the hypothesis running through his whole work, that the writer of Chronicles composed all the sections parallel with the books of Samuel and Kings out of these as his chief sources. With this presupposition, which Movers shares with the opponents of the credibility of Chronicles, his whole investigation must be a medley of truth and error, of one-sided, warped, and perverse remarks, along with many just and striking disquisitions, and, missing its aim, only contribute to confirm the opponent in his prejudices.

view with which the two epitomisers proceeded in their task,[1] and may be satisfactorily resolved, as I have already shown in my apol. Vers. p. 361 ff. Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 253 f.) has recently acknowledged this, though he has pronounced the deviations to be greater than they really are, as will be shown in the course of the exposition.

V. 4. In the seventh year of the sovereignty of Athaliah, and after the deliverance of Jehoash, Jehoiada the high priest made a covenant with the officers of the royal guards in the temple to overthrow the tyrant, and place the young Jehoash, whom he showed them, on the throne. Chronicles gives not only the names of these officers in v. 1, but makes the further disclosure, that the high priest, by means of these men, who entered into covenant with him, summoned to him the Levites out of all the country, and the heads of houses of Israel to Jerusalem, probably under colour of a festival, in order to make sure of their assistance in the execution of his plan. שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאיוֹת are officers of war, and, as the addition לַכָּרִי וְלָרָצִים proves, of the royal body guards, not the Levites, as Seb. Schm., Dahler, and others suppose. On כרי and רצים comp. above p. 14 f.[2] As to the form מְאָיוֹת for מֵאוֹת comp. Ew. Gr. § 437.

Vv. 5—8. After all the parties initiated into the plan by the high priest had assembled, on the day of execution, he issues the necessary orders, in which he assigns to them the places they were to occupy and guard, and, indeed, according to our narrative, so that he divided those who mounted guard on the Sab-

[1] Our author wishes simply to relate, how the royal family, brought to the verge of ruin, was miraculously preserved according to the Divine promise, the tyrant Athaliah overthrown, and the rightful heir of the house of David placed on the throne of his fathers. The writer of Chronicles connects with this general theocratic object the special design of drawing a picture of the venerable high priest Jehoiada, and setting forth at large the activity of the Levites and priests in this work. Comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 1, p. 253 f.

[2] The לְ prefixed to רצים and כרי is *nota genit.*, and chosen to avoid a double construct state, comp. Ew. Gr. § 517. Hartz p. q. p. 61 has quite mistaken the sense, when he renders ויקח את שׂרי וגו' "he took the heads of houses for (or instead of) Chari and Ratsim (body guards and heralds.)"

bath into three parts, committed to one third the keeping of the king's house, stationed the second at the gate Sur, and the third at the gate behind the runners. Moreover, all who were relieved on the Sabbath were to keep the watch of the temple beside the king in two divisions. According to the narrative of Chron., in which the last named two divisions are not mentioned, those entering upon guard on the Sabbath were so distributed that the one third should be keepers of the thresholds, the second at the house of the king, the third at the gate of Jesod, and the whole people in the courts of the house of the Lord. If we compare the two narratives, it appears that, according to them, the two divisions are the same; the one division, which is to keep מִשְׁמֶרֶת בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ (v. 5), is evidently identical with that which is to stand בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ (Chr. v. 5), in like manner that at the gate סוּר (v. 6) is the same as that at the gate יְסוֹד (Chr. v. 5.) But is the third division at the gate אַחַר הָרָצִים (v. 6), also identical with that which was appointed לְשֹׁעֲרֵי הַסִּפִּים (Chr. v. 4)? This question it is not easy to answer, and yet its solution is of the greatest importance, not only for the right conception of our narrative, but also for the right adjustment of the mutual relation of the two narratives. Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 225) had declared himself very decidedly for the diversity, and asserts that the author of the Books of Kings speaks "throughout only of the body guard,[1] the Chronicles on the contrary of the Levites *and* the body guard, and indeed so that the third, which was to guard the temple (the שׁערי הספים v. 4) are priests and Levites, the other two thirds, who were to occupy the royal palace, a gate, and the courts of the temple, are not Levites, but the royal body guard, which the author of Chronicles denotes by the general expression כָּל־הָעָם." But this last assertion is as arbitrary as false; for כל־העם is expressly distinguished from the three divisions, and another place assigned to it, namely in the courts of the temple, whereas the second division is posted בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ, and the third בְּשַׁעַר הַיְסוֹד. Now if בבית המלך here mean "in

[1] Hävern. thereby appears in contradiction with his own assumption, Vol. i. 2, p. 593, where he quotes v. 6 of our chapter to prove, that the guards and keepers of the sanctuary were Levites.

the king's palace," as Häv. assumes, the royal palace must have been situated in the courts of the temple.—The בָּאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת and יֹצְאֵי הַשַּׁבָּת "the comers in and goers out of the Sabbath" denote the divisions of the guard, which commenced their service on the Sabbath, and were relieved on the Sabbath. That by these are to be understood the Levites, on whom lay the guardianship of the approaches to the temple, appears, irrespective altogether of the addition לַכֹּהֲנִים וְלַלְוִיִּם (Chr. v. 4), from the fact that from the time of David the priests and Levites were divided into classes, each of which had to attend to the service a week from one Sabbath to the other (1 Chr. xxiii.—xxvi., comp. Joseph. *Antiq*. vii. 14, 7; and Luk. i. 5.) But there is an entire want of historical evidence, that there was in the royal guards a like division and obligation of service, whereby the assumption, that by באי השבת and יצאי הש׳ here the royal satellites are to be understood, becomes very questionable. To this it is added, that according to v. 7 all those retiring on the Sabbath are to keep the guard of the house of the Lord by the king (who was in the temple), that is, to guard the king. Would Jehoiada have committed the guarding of the young king in the temple all at once to the watch relieved from the royal palace? Certainly not; and wherefore should he have appointed to this duty the very satellites released in the palace from guarding Athaliah? We must therefore concede to Chronicles that the Levites surrounded the young king (v. 7), whence it farther follows, that the יצאי השבת and באי הש׳ are the Levitical temple watch, of which Jehoiada did not release those, whose service ended with the Sabbath, but retained them in the inner apartments of the temple buildings to guard the young king, while the divisions, which entered upon duty, were so disposed, that the gates and avenues to the temple were occupied by them. According to this view, which is alone based upon the words, and farther confirmed by v. 10, we must affirm the identity of the הַשְּׁלִשִׁית בַּשַּׁעַר אַחַר הָרָצִים with the third of the priests and Levites appointed to be שֹׁעֲרֵי הַסִּפִּים. Thus the difference between our narrative and that in Chronicles consists neither in this, that Chronicles makes the Levites perform that which, according to the Books of Kings, the uninitiated satellites do, as de

Wette asserts; nor in this, that our author from his political point of view speaks only of the body-guard, but Chronicles along with the Levites, who in accordance with their priestly character are made to occupy the foreground, names also, v. 5, the body-guard, who had occupied the royal palace and a temple-gate, as Häv. assumes; but in this, that in our narrative the Levites are not mentioned *by name*. According to both narratives, Jehoiada, the high priest, stands at the head of the whole undertaking, and employs for its execution in the first place several officers of the guard in his interest, who then summon the Levites and heads of the people to Jerusalem. The execution itself is so effected, that the officers of the guard take the commands of the officiating priests, and by them occupy the nearer approaches to the temple, whereby a certain obscurity arises in our narrative simply from this, that the assignment of the command over the Levites to the officers of the guard is not expressly mentioned. To this Levitical party according to both narratives is added also a military party, which in Chronicles is comprehended under the general term כל העם, whereas in our narrative besides the כל העם (v. 19) הרצים (v. 11) are also expressly mentioned. But רצים are not the whole royal guard, but only the satellites who attached themselves to their leaders (the officers of the guard) and declared for the young king against Athaliah. These, armed with the rest of the people, were stationed from the right to the left wing of the temple opposite the altar of burnt-offering and the house (the temple) around the king, that is, outside of the temple watch who immediately surrounded the king (v. 11, and Chr. v. 10).—הַשְּׁלִשִׁית מִכֶּם בָּאֵי וגו "the third part of you shall commence duty on the Sabbath and keep the watch of the king's house,"[1] for

[1] Seb. Schm. thus understands the words: *tertia pars ex vobis (omnibus) scil. ii qui veniunt Sabbatho, ex hac inquam parte erit tertia pars custodientes custodiam etc.* The sense remains the same, but on account of the ellipse involved in this view it recommends itself less than that given in the text. The words moreover refer to all the Levites except those who were already on duty at the temple. Of these a third was to keep guard at the house of the king, the other two-thirds to be posted elsewhere. Several Rabbins, with whom L. de Dieu (*crit. ss. ad h. l.*) concurs, assume on the whole only three divisions, those of the Levites, who commence duty on the Sabbath, the other two consisting of

which in Chr. v. 5 stands simply, the third part shall be בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ. These words cannot with Häv. be understood of the occupation of the royal palace. Against this is the circumstance, that Athaliah comes from the palace to the people in the temple (v. 13); that farther the officers, the body guard and the whole people are in the temple (v. 19), and only after the anointing of the king and the subsequent putting of Athaliah to death do they proceed from the house of the Lord to the royal palace. Either בית המלך here denotes, not the royal palace, but the dwelling-place of the young king in a part of the temple buildings (Vatabl., Hertz., in p. q. p. 56), or the phrase בְּבֵית הַמֶּלֶךְ means at the house = towards the house of the king. The expression used in our narrative שָׁמַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת, "to attend to the king's house, observe, guard it" (see above p. 20), is so indefinite that it can determine nothing. שַׁעַר סוּר is generally admitted to be equivalent to שַׁעַר יְסוֹד. But whether סוּר be only an error of the pen for יְסוֹד, as Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 308) and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 945) assume, or another name for שַׁעַר יְסוֹד foundation gate, remains uncertain, as the name of this gate does not again occur. The older expositors are even in doubt, whether it be a gate of the temple or of the royal palace; but the connexion decides for a temple gate.[1] The following determination of place also, "at the gate behind the runners," is obscure; for though it is natural on comparison with v. 19 to identify שַׁעַר אַחַר הָרָצִים with שַׁעַר הָרָצִים, yet the expression "gate behind the runners (satellites)" is peculiar and can only be explained by the supposition, that the satellites, when

those who retire (v. 7), but these latter are clearly distinct from the three divisions mentioned in v. 6; most expositors therefore (Jarchi, Vatabl., C. a Lap., Seb. Schm., Grotius and others) acknowledge a double division.

[1] Here the old translators have only guessed. LXX. πύλη τῶν ὁδῶν, Chald. תְּרַע גִּבָּרַיָּא gate of the heroes, Syr. and Arab. ܬܪܥܐ ܕܩܪܒܐ and باب الحرب war-gate. The Rabb. understand it by the eastern gate of the court, and explain שַׁעַר סוּר *porta recessus*, so called because at it the unclean were addressed thus סוּרוּ *recede*, Lam. iv. 15. Comp. Meyer, *adnotat. ad Seder Olam* p. 936 and M. Fr. Beck, Rem. on the Targum of Chronicles ii. p. 220.

they accompanied the king to the temple (1 Ki. xiv. 28) had a stated place in one of the outer temple apartments, after which the adjacent gate was named. This gate lay probably in the southwest corner of the outer court, where the way was to the royal palace on Zion; see on v. 19. The following words: "and ye shall keep the watch of the house in defence (מַסָּח)," which must necessarily be referred to all the three before-mentioned divisions, prove most decisively, that all three were stationed to guard the temple and not one of them in the royal palace. מַסָּח, which the LXX. and Luther regarded as *nom. propr.*, comes from נָסַח *depellere*, and is to be taken with Maur. and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 890) in opposition with מִשְׁמֶרֶת, the defensive watch, to ward off the people. V. 7. וּשְׁתֵּי הַיָּדוֹת וגו' and the two parts of you, namely, all that go out on the Sabbath, that is, are relieved, they shall keep, etc.," that is, as it is more particularly stated, v. 8, they shall surround the king in all his movements (in going in and out) and let no one come within the ranges, who might endanger his life.

Vv. 9—12. Comp. Chr. vv. 8—11. After Jehoiada had issued the necessary orders, and given to the officers of the body guard, who had come into the temple unarmed to avoid observation, the spears and shields of king David preserved in the temple, the officers with the armed Levites attached to each proceeded to their places.[1] At the same time the satellites who came with them took their station with the people in the front of the court from the right to the left wing of the temple buildings before the altar of burnt-offering and the temple. There Jehoiada brought forth the young king, placed the crown upon him, and

[1] This circumstance also furnishes an important proof, that the men placed under the officers of the guard (v. 9) were not the royal body guards but the Levites. For if the officers of the guard had marched with their men to the temple, they would not have come without arms. For in that case they could not have come privately, which was quite possible on the contrary, if they came along without the body guard, and first in the temple itself took the command of the Levites, who as usual proceeded on the Sabbath to the temple there to perform their duty. On the whole the royal body guard, as such, could not have marched to the temple without raising the suspicion of a revolt, even if it had been intended to acquaint them at first with the conspiracy, which is also improbable.

gave him the testimony, whereupon they made him king by anointing and solemn acclamation.—אִישׁ אֶת־אֲנָשָׁיו "every man his men," that is, the armed Levites assigned to him. אֶת־הַחֲנִית (v. 10) stands collectively for אֶת הַחֲנִיתִים (Chr. v. 10.) The רצים (v. 11) are different from the אֲנָשָׁיו (v. 9), for they take another position than that of the אֲנָשִׁים placed under the command of the officers of the guards. Chronicles has for this the more general term כל העם, which is even more significant, inasmuch as the satellites might have been joined by many of the people, who made common cause with them; and hence in v. 13 the people and in v. 19 along with the royal body guards כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ is mentioned. עַל הַמֶּלֶךְ סָבִיב stands in v. 11 proleptically, as the officers with their men could not stand round about the king, before the young Joash was brought forth and anointed king, which again could not take place before the Levites and soldiers had occupied the places assigned to them. —V. 12. הָעֵדוּת signifies neither the royal robes (בגדי מלכות Kimchi, Vatabl., Vatke, bibl. Theol. p. 410) nor *insignia regia* (Cler., Dathe), nor the *phylacteria* (Grot.), nor Samuel's laws of the kingdom (Gramb. Religionsid. ii. p. 175), but the law of Moses, which is often called the testimony (see above p. 20), as Jarchi, Abarb., C. a Lap., Seb. Schm., and others, have rightly observed, and as at present even de Wette (Einl. p. 212) finds probable. The high priest presented to the young king the book of the law as the rule of his life and government according to the direction, Deut. xvii. 18 ff. Comp. Hävern. Einl. i. 2 p. 594 f. With regard to the anointing, see above p. 12, and on יְחִי הַמֶּלֶךְ comp. p. 7.

Vv. 13—16. Comp. Chr. vv. 12—15. As soon as Athaliah heard the loud shouting of the people, she came to the people into the court of the temple, and when she beheld the young king on his platform surrounded by the princes, the musicians playing and the multitude shouting, she rent her garments in terror and cried, Conspiracy, conspiracy! But Jehoiada commanded the officers of the guards to bring her out of the ranges, and to slay every one that followed her, in order that the temple might not be stained with blood, whereupon she went back to the palace

and was there slain. הָרָצִין הָעָם is no *trajectio* for *populi currentis* (Kimchi, Cler., Dathe) but *constructio asyndeta*, "of the runners (and) the people." On the Chald. plural ending ין. See on 1 Ki. xi. 33.—V. 14. "The king stood on the platform according to right," that is, as it behoved him. הָעַמּוּד is here no pillar, but a raised stand, (*suggestus*), which was erected at the east gate of the inner court (בַּמָּבוֹא, Chr. v. 13, comp. Ezek. xlvi. 2) for the king, when he visited the temple during the festivals (comp. xxiii. 3), and was probably the same with the brazen scaffold erected by Solomon, 2 Chr. vi. 13. Comp. my treatise, der Tempel Sal. p. 130, not.[1] For מִשְׁפָּט, see on i. 7. The שָׂרִים (v. 14) are certainly, not exclusively the שָׂרֵי הַמֵּאוֹת, but these and the other assembled heads of the people. הַחֲצֹצְרוֹת stands by metonomy for הַמְחַצְּרִים, the trumpeters, that is, the Levites blowing, 1 Chr. xiii. 8, xv. 24—28, xvi. 42, etc.; for they are different from the people blowing on trumpets. V. 15. הַבָּא אַחֲרֶיהָ, whoever follows her, *qui partes ejus sumit, ei auxiliaturus*. Seb. Schm.—V. 16. וַיָּשִׂמוּ לָהּ יָדַיִם means, not they laid hands on her (LXX., Vulg., Luth., and others), but they made way for her on both sides (Chald., Syr., Jarchi, Kimchi, Maurer, and others.) מְבוֹא הַסּוּסִים = שַׁעַר הַסּוּסִים (Chr. v. 15), *via per quam equi regis introduci solebant* Vatabl., Grotius.) This gateway is not farther known.[1]

Vv. 17—20. Comp. Chr. vv. 16—21. After Joash was crowned and Athaliah put to death, the high priest made a covenant first between the Lord and the king and people, and then between the king and the people. The covenant of the king and

[1] When some older theologians, as Vitringa, *de Synag. vet. proleg.* c. 4 p. 29 ff., Lundius, jüd. Heiligth. p. 375, and others, explain them as different, it is under the erroneous impression that Solomon's scaffold was erected *in atrio sacerdotum*, whereas according to 2 Chr. vi. 13, it was put up in the outer court (הָעֲזָרָה, comp. 2 Chr. iv. 9.)

[1] Robinson (Pal. ii. p. 118) considers it identical with the horse gate mentioned, Neh. iii. 28. J. N. Tiele (in Tholuck's lit. Anz. 1844 No. 41) conjectures that Athaliah went from Zion to the temple and returned over the bridge, of which Rob. (ii. p. 64 ff.) has discovered some remains, and which Tiele also believes mentioned as the עֲלִיָּה, 2 Chr. ix. 4, comp. 1 Ki. x. 5.

people with the Lord was only a renewal of the covenant which the Lord had made with Israel by Moses, Ex. xix. and xxiv. by which king and people bound themselves, לִהְיוֹת לְעָם לַיהוָה Deut. iv. 20, xxvii. 9 f., and which was based upon the "testimony" presented to the king at his coronation. Comp. Hävern. Einl. i. 2 p. 595. A consequence of this covenant was the covenant between the king and the people, by which the king promised to govern the people according to the law of the Lord, and the people engaged to be subject to the king as the lawful governor placed over them by the Lord. Comp. the first note on 1 Ki. xii. The renewal of the covenant with the Lord was necessary, as the people under the preceding sovereigns had revolted from the Lord and addicted themselves to the worship of Baal. The immediate salutary fruit of this covenant was therefore the destruction of the temple of Baal with his altars and images, and the slaying of the priest of Baal by the people (v. 18.) This temple of Baal was probably built by Jehoram and Athaliah, who introduced the worship of Baal into Judah, comp. viii. 27, and Joseph *Antiq.* ix. 7—4.—הֵיטֵב stands adverbially in the sense *bene*, bravely; in fact, wholly, completely, as Deut. ix. 21. V. 19. Hereupon Jehoiada placed the temple again under its customary officers, and then brought the young king with the captains of the body-guard, the satellites and the whole people to the royal palace, and there set the king upon the throne of his fathers. פְּקֻדֹּת are not merely the sentries, but *praefecturae*, and denotes the collective body of priests and Levites, who were invested with ruling offices in the temple, of which the door-keepers formed only a part. For the enthronement of Joash not only the officiating Levites were placed under military commanders, but also the royal satellites and the people were stationed in the courts to guard the external approaches to the temple. As soon, therefore, as the object of this extraordinary expedient was attained, Jehoiada, who had arranged it, again suspended it and committed the oversight of the temple to the Levitical prefects appointed for this purpose by the law, and the distribution of the Levites and priests instituted by David, as the Chronicles relate at large from their priestly point of view. Comp. my apol. Vers. p. 370. With respect to the שַׁעַר

הָרָצִים comp. on v. 6. If its identity with שַׁעַר אַחַר הָרָצִים (v. 6) be well founded, we are to understand by it a gate of the temple, which in Chr. v. 20 is called שַׁעַר הָעֶלְיוֹן, comp. xv. 35, and 2 Chr. xxvii. 3.[1] In v. 20 this narrative is closed with a statement of the result of the whole proceeding, namely, that it corresponded with the wishes of the people, and the peace of the city was not disturbed by the overthrow of the tyrant.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### REIGN OF JOASH KING OF JUDAH, AND REPAIR OF THE TEMPLE.

To this chapter also Chronicles (2, xxiv.) furnishes a parallel in which the deviations are again completely explained by the particular object of the chronicler, namely, to give special prominence to the share of the Levites in the repair of the temple, so that de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 98 ff.) and Gramberg (die Glaubw. d. Chr. p. 139, 149 ff., and Relgionsid. i. p. 226 and 258) could only maintain the objection that in Chronicles the history is garbled in favour of the Levites, by garbling both narratives. See my apol. Vers. p. 371 ff., Dahler i. p. q. p. 119 ff., Hertz i. p. q. p. 70 ff., Movers krit. Unters. p. 312 ff.,[2] and Hävern. Einl. ii. 1, p. 255 f.

Vv. 1—4. *Beginning, duration, and spirit of the reign of Joash.* —Concerning Beersheba (v. 2) compare 1 Ki. xix. 3.—V. 3.

[1] The reasons by which Tiele, i. p. q. p. 327, wishes to prove that it signifies not a gate of the temple, but the high bridge between Moriah and Zion, are much too weak to support such a conclusion.

[2] Movers here certainly pronounces the chronicler quite free from the charge brought against him by de Wette and Gramberg, but yet only in the very unsatisfactory way, that, imputing to our author a dishonest concealment of the truth, he declares that, according to both narratives, the Levites had embezzled the money collected for the repair of the temple, according to which de Wette at present (in the Einl. p. 255 and 264) asserts, that in Chronicles this "tacit inculpation" lying in 2 Ki. xii. 4 *is softened.*

"He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord as long as Jehoiada the priest instructed him." כָּל־יָמָיו אֲשֶׁר *omnibus diebus suis, quibus.* אֲשֶׁר depends on יָמָיו, not on הַיָּשָׁר, by which connexion J. D. Mich. brings our verse into contradiction with 2 Chr. xxv. 3 and 16 ff., and then endeavours to avoid it by arbitrary alterations of the text. The instruction of Joash by Jehoiada continued as long as this true priest of the Lord lived, to whom Joash owed his life and throne. So long also Joash remained true to the covenant made with the Lord when he ascended the throne; but after the death of Jehoiada he yielded to the request of the princes of Judah, and consented to the idolatry prohibited by the covenant with the Lord, so that they served Asherim and idols, and at length went so far as to cause the prophet Zechariah, the worthy son of his benefactor Jehoiada, to be stoned to death on account of his open censure of the revolt from the Lord, 2 Chr. xxiv. 17—22. Comp. my apol. Vers. p. 415, and Mov. i. p. q. p. 160 f.—Only the worship on high places was not entirely suppressed during Jehoiada's instruction of the king. V. 4. Comp. on the standing formula of this verse at 1 Ki. xv. 14.

Vv. 5, 6. While Joash was truly devoted to the Lord, he made arrangements for repairing the temple, and for this purpose commanded the priests to collect in the land the tax to be paid to the sanctuary, and therewith to defray the expenses of repairing the temple. הַקֳּדָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר יוּבָא *L. de Dieu* renders, *argentum sacrorum quod inferendum est;* grammatically more correct *quod inferri solet* (Cler.), comp. Ew. Gr. § 264.[1] This tax was threefold: 1. כֶּסֶף עוֹבֵר "money of the numbered." This expression is explained by the phrase used, Ex. xxx. 13, כָּל־הָעֹבֵר עַל־הַפְּקֻדִים all "who pass through the enumeration" shall give half a shekel as an offering to the Lord. 2.

[1] The context also requires this view, especially the arrangement that every priest was to receive it from his acquaintances (v. 6), which was not possible, if every Israelite had brought the money to the temple, because his acquaintances might not be at all times on duty. Thus the same is here intimated, which is more clearly stated, 2 Chr. xxiv. 5, that the priests were to collect it in the cities of Judah from all the people.

אִישׁ כֶּסֶף נַפְשׁוֹת עֶרְכּוֹ "money of the estimation of every soul," that is, the money, which, if any one had devoted himself or any one belonging to him to the Lord, was to be paid for the redemption of this person according to the estimation (עֶרֶךְ נְפָשׁוֹת) appointed in the law (Lev. xxvii. 1—8) for the different ages and sexes, and accordingly administered by the priests. 3. כָּל־כֶּסֶף אֲשֶׁר יַעֲלֶה וגו׳, "all money, which it comes into the heart of any one to bring into the house of the Lord," that is, the money, which was brought as a freewill offering to the sanctuary.[1] In Chronicles the different kinds of money to be col-

[1] The two last mentioned taxes are rightly understood by most expositors, the first on the contrary is mistaken by many, even by J. D. Mich., who has written a Mos. Recht. Although the Chald. rightly explains עֹבֵר by דְּעָבַר עַל מִנְיַן גּוּבְרַיָּא *quae transit super computum virorum*, as in Ex. xxx. 13, דְּעָבַר עַל מִנְיָנַיָּא and Jarchi, Abarb., Seb. Münst., Vatabl., *L. de Dieu*, and others, have expressly pointed to this law of Moses for the elucidation of the phrase, yet by an improper reference to Gen. xxiii. 16, the false explanation, current, (Luth.), *pecunia usuaria* (Seb. Schm.), current money (de Wette, Ges. *thes.* ii. 982, and Winer *lex.* p. 689) has become generally prevalent, against which in recent times only Hertz. i. p. q. p. 72, and Häv. Einl. i. 2, p. 594, have again maintained the right interpretation. Of the incorrectness of the explanation, current coin, there can be no doubt; for even if we do not insist with Hävernick, that this must necessarily be עֹבֵר לַסֹּחֵר as in Gen. xxiii. 16, since the phrase might be abbreviated as one well known, as it actually is abbreviated from עֹבֵר עַל־הַפְּקֻדִים, yet it is decidedly against this explanation, that כֶּסֶף עֹבֵר must have referred as well to the free-will contribution as to the estimation money; but in this case scarcely any reason can be imagined, why money current with the merchant only should have been required, as not only Moses had asked and accepted, as free-will offerings for the building of the tabernacle, gold, silver, copper, purple, fine linen, and other materials from the people (Ex. xxv. 2 f., xxxv. 5, xxxvi. 5 f.), but David also had received as free-will offerings from the heads of the people, for the building of the temple, gold and silver, copper, iron, and precious stones, and other articles of value, as each one had and was willing to give (1 Chr. xxix. 6 ff.) Might not Joash have employed similar things of value, instead of money current in commerce, for the repair of the temple? The context is thus most decidedly against this explanation, and points to the arrangement, naturally occurring to every Israelite acquainted with the law, Ex. xxx.

lected are not specialized, but comprehended v. 6 in the words, "the collection of Moses the servant of the Lord and of the congregation of Israel for the tabernacle of witness, under which are included not merely the tax of half a shekel, ordained Ex. xxx. 12 ff., for the building of the tabernacle, but also the other two contributions. Besides it is said in v. 5 of Chr., that they were to collect the money from year to year and repair the temple, which is not expressly mentioned in our narrative, but lay in the nature of the thing, as not only the estimation tax for persons devoted to the Lord must have come in annually, but also, what many expositors deny, the poll tax must have paid annually, and the repair could scarcely have been completed in one year, as under the idolatrous reigns of Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah, the temple of the Lord must have been neglected (Chr. v. 7.)

Vv. 7—10. Comp. Chr. 6—10. By this arrangement of the king, however, the repair of the temple had not been effected in the twenty-third year of his reign, because the priest did not hasten the matter (Chr. v. 5.) The year in which it was adopted is not mentioned in either narrative, so that it is impossible to determine how long it was without effect; but it was at all events so long as to satisfy the king that it was vain and ineffectual. With the consent of the priests therefore, he introduces a new arrangement. He took from the priests the collection of the money and the repairing of the temple, and caused a chest to be placed by the high priest at the entrance into the temple on the right side of the altar of burnt-offering, into which the money offered by the people for the repair of the temple was to be put by the Levites keeping the door, and commanded this arrangement to be made known in Jerusalem and to all the people. The reason of the inefficiency of the former method is not stated in our narrative. J. D. Mich., de Wette, Gramberg, Deres., and Mov. find it in this, that the priests had embezzled the money collected. But had the king entertained such a suspicion against the priests, he would not have asked for their

12 ff., where עֹבֵר also occurs; and this so much the more, as the money to be demanded was destined for the same object, for which Moses had appointed the poll-tax, namely, the building of the sanctuary.

consent to a change or to the new arrangement, much less have commanded that the door-keeping priests should put the money contributed into the chest, because no check would thereby have been put to fraud, as the door-keepers had only not to cast the money into the chest if they wished to embezzle it. The ground and occasion for the abandonment of the first and the introduction of the new measure lay simply in this, that the former had proved inadequate to the end hoped for by the king. Inasmuch as the king assigned no definite sum for the repair of the temple, but left it to the priests out of the money collected, of which a part at least, according to the law, was justly due to them for the maintenance of themselves and the worship of God, to defray besides the expense of repairing the buildings, it might easily happen, without the least fraud on the part of the priests, that the money collected would be given out for the immediate necessities of religious worship and personal sustenance, and nothing remain over for the purposes of repair. If, therefore, we look to our narrative alone, the priests might be acquitted of all blame. On the contrary, in Chronicles, it is matter of reproach, certainly not to their advantage, as de Wette still asserts, that they did not hasten with the matter, that they were dilatory in the collection of the money, as well as in applying a portion of their revenues to the repair of the temple. But the object of the chest was to separate at once the money to be collected for the building from the other moneys coming in and destined for the priests, and also to augment the contributions for the building, as it was expected that the people would give more, when the collection was appointed for the special purpose of repairing the temple, than when they were to give the legal and voluntary payments only to the priests, whereby no giver knew how much of it might be applied for building. This latter object lies explicitly enough in the words of Chr. v. 10, "And the princes and all the people rejoiced, and brought the contribution and cast into the chest until it was full. But the new arrangement adopted by the king was not confined merely to the setting up of the chest for the collection of the money, so that the priests were no longer obliged to collect money around the country, but applied at the same time to this, לְבִלְתִּי חַזֵּק וגו׳, that is, that the priests should no longer attend to the repair of

the temple. The king himself, therefore, undertook the management, that is, the superintendence of it. The words, "Receive no (more) money of your acquaintance, but give it for the repair of the house" (v. 8), have this meaning, collect no more money to defray the cost of the worship, your own necessities, and the building, but let it be applied to the repair of the temple, to which I will attend. That the meaning can be no other, appears clearly from that which, according to v. 9, the priests consented henceforth to do. V. 10. "And Jehoiada took a chest," etc., namely, by order of the king, as is evident of itself from what goes before and as it is expressly stated in Chr. v. 8.

Vv. 11—13. Chr. vv. 11—13. When the king had undertaken the superintendence of the repair of the temple, he sent his scribe, as often as the chest was full, that he, in conjunction with a person deputed by the high-priest, should count the money, hand over the sum to the overseers of the building, who paid the workmen with it and purchased materials. Instead of הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל (v. 11) is named in Chronicles פְּקִיד כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ "the deputy of the high-priest," as the high-priest effected the business either sometimes or probably always by a delegate. צוּר to bind in a bag, comp. v. 23. V. 12. עֹשֵׂי הַמְּלָאכָה וגו׳, "that did the work, that were appointed over the house of the Lord," that is, those who superintended and conducted the building of the house. הפקדים is according to the *Kethibh partic. paul* פְּקֻדִים, which is quite suitable, comp. xi. 15 and Num. xxxi. 48, so that the *keri* is unnecessary.

Vv. 14—17. Vessels for the temple were not procured with this money, namely, until the completion of the repairs. What then remained over was according to Chr. v. 14 applied to this purpose. No account of the application of the money was required of the overseers of the building, as their integrity was undoubted (v. 16.) "The money of trespass and sin-offerings was not brought into the temple," that is, applied to defray the cost of its repair, but was left to the priests, as the law prescribed. According to Lev. v. 16 and Num. v. 8 in the trespass-offering restitution was to be made for the earthly trespass according to the estimation of the priest, with the addition of a fifth part in money, which money fell to the priest not only in the trespass

committed by the violation of what was to be performed or belonged to the Lord, but also in the injury of the goods belonging to a neighbour, if the neighbour, to whom otherwise the restitution was to be made, was no longer living; comp. Kurtz, das Mos. Opfer, p. 202 ff.—In the sin-offering the priest received no money, but in certain sin-offerings the flesh of the victim that was not burned upon the altar was assigned to him. Most expositors therefore assume, that the Israelites living at a distance had sent money to the priests, with which they paid for the sin-offerings, and kept the surplus, if any, to themselves. But a custom so contradictory to the law could scarcely have existed at that time, and even if it did, the words could not well be understood of such an abuse. כֶּסֶף חַטָּאוֹת is in substance identical with כֶּסֶף אָשָׁם and the double designation of the same thing is explained by this, that in the Pentateuch אָשָׁם and חַטָּאת are often combined, the ritual for each is almost the same (Lev. vii. 7, xiv. 13), and in general the notions of sin and trespass are very closely connected.

Vv. 18, 19. The brief notice of the expedition of Hazael against Jerusalem is supplemented by 2 Chr. xxiv. 23, 24. After the Syrians under Hazael had taken the Philistine Gath, Hazael sent a small body of troops against Jerusalem, which smote the much stronger army of Joash, so that the Jews lost many men, especially many princes of the people, but the Syrians took much spoil and sent it to Damascus. In order, therefore, to prevent Jerusalem from being taken by the Syrians, Joash took all the treasures of the temple and of his palace and therewith purchased the withdrawal of the Syrians. Thus the two brief accounts of the expedition harmonize and illustrate each other. There is neither a contradiction between them, as Credner, Comm. on Joel p. 57, asserts, comp. on the contrary, my apol. Vers. p. 416, nor is there any necessity for the assumption of Kimchi, Vatabl., Calm., and others, that our verses speak of an earlier expedition different from that in Chr., against which Seb. Schm. has justly declared. It did not concern the author of Chronicles to state all the historical circumstances of the war, as he only wished to show how Joash was punished for his revolt from the Lord, and his cruelty to the prophet Zechariah; in our

narrative the external occasion of the march of the Syrians to Jerusalem, and the manner in which Joash preserved his capital from conquest, are stated, while the particular course of the war is omitted. The time of the war is, v. 17, not more exactly determined than by אָז *tunc;* according to Chr., it occurred in the last year of Joash, a long time after the death of Jehoiada, the high priest, after which Joash, seduced by his nobles, had forsaken the Lord. גַּת is the often-mentioned Philistine city Gath, which, under Solomon, whose dominion extended also over the Philistines to Gaza (1 Ki. v. 1, 4), had a king Achish tributary to Israel (1 Ki. ii. 39), and was fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chr. xi. 8.) Among the five chief cities of the Philistines Gath lay nearest to Jerusalem, according to Hieron. on Mic. i., on the way from Eleutheropolis to Gaza, close upon the Jewish border, comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 189, and Ges. *thes.* ii. 849, but was, even in ancient times, utterly destroyed, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 690 f. Whether Gath was at this time subject to the kingdom of Judah or independent, cannot, from defective accounts, be determined. For, although a part of the Philistines brought presents (2 Chr. xvii. 11), that is, paid tribute to king Jehoshaphat, yet under his son Jehoram, the Philistines, with the Arabians, invaded Judah, plundered Jerusalem, and carried off the royal princes, (2 Chr. xxi. 16), whereby it remains uncertain whether those of Gath belonged to the party or not. Equally uncertain is it, when Gath was again taken from the Syrians. That it was effected by Jehoash of Israel, son of Jehoahaz, as Winer, R. W. i. p. 46 assumes as certain, v. Raumer, as probable, cannot be inferred either from the fact, that this king recovered from the Syrians all the cities, which they had taken from the Israelites under Jehoahaz (xiii. 25), or even with certainty from this, that he smote and took captive the Jewish king Amaziah at Bethshemesh, which lay on the Philistine border (xiii. 13, 2 Chr. xxv. 21 ff.) It is only certain that Uzziah quite reduced the Philistines and razed the walls of Gath (2 Chr. xxvi. 6), after which Gath never recovered its independence, comp. Amos vi. 2. שׂוּם פָּנָיו with a following *infin.* means *proposuit sibi aliquid facere, speciatim de proficiscendi proposito,* used not only by the Hebrews, but by the Arabs, Syrians, Persians, and Turks, (see Ges. *thes.*

ii. 1109.) Comp. Jer. xlii. 15, and *στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* Luk. ix. 51. He resolved to advance against Jerusalem, after, as appears from Chr., the Jewish army sent against him was defeated. V. 19. "All the hallowed things, that Jehoshaphat, Joram, and Ahaziah, his father . . . had dedicated, and his own hallowed things. Joram and Ahaziah were certainly addicted to the worship of Baal (viii. 18, 27, and 2 Chr. xxi. 6, 10, xxii. 3 f.), but yet might, from political motives, and now and then even from a fit of piety, make some presents to the temple, as the service of Baal did not necessarily exclude the worship of Jehovah.[1]

Vv. 20—22. Not long after the departure of the Syrians, Joash was murdered in consequence of a conspiracy by some of his servants. Here also Chronicles (2d, xxiv. 25 ff.) completes our brief narrative. According to it the Syrians had left Joash in many diseases (מַחֲלֻיִים probably wounds, which he had received from them in battle), whereupon his servants formed the conspiracy, put him to death in his bed, and buried him in the city of David indeed, but not in the sepulchres of the kings. The conspirators are called, v. 22, Jozachar the son of Shimeath, and Jehozabad the son of Shomer; in Chr. v. 26, Zabad the son of Shimeath the Ammonitess, and Jehozabad the son of Shimrith the Moabitess. The identity of the latter name is obvious; for שֹׁמֵר is only another form of שִׁמְרִית; but even that of the former cannot be mistaken; זָבָד (Chr.) is a mere error of the pen for זָכָר, and this an abbreviated form of יוֹזָכָר.—Concerning "the house of Millo, which goeth down to Silla" (הַיֹּרֵד סִלָּא) conjectures only can be formed. Millo is without doubt the castle of this name on Mount Zion (see on 1 Ki. ix. 15), and the

[1] With this also agrees the statement, 2 Chr. xxiv. 7. "For the wicked Athaliah (and) her sons (Ahaziah and his brothers) have ruined the house of God, and also all the dedicated things of the house of the Lord they have made to be Baal's;" for it is not here said, that they made images of Baal out of the gifts of the temple, as it might appear according to the ungrammatical rendering of this verse by de Wette, "and also out of all the consecrated things of the house have they made Baals," but only that they, from their heart being given to Baal, perverted even the gifts which they offered to the house of the Lord, to the service of Baal, because by a heart divided between Baal and Jehovah, they had changed Jehovah himself into a Baal.

narr
Je
fr



house of Millo probably the place of residence in this castle, the situation of which was designed to be more exactly determined by the added הַיֹּרֵד סִלָּא. Some regard סִלָּא as an abbreviation from מְסִלָּה, a high way, others as a *nom. propr. loci vel oppidi* in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Thus, according to all the old versions, Winer in his *lex.* p. 674, and Ges. in his *thes.* ii. 958.

END OF VOLUME FIRST.

## NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

---

MESSRS CLARK, *in completing the issue of their* FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY *for* 1857, *beg to return respectful thanks to their Subscribers for the continued support they receive.*

*The first issue for* 1858 *will be the two last volumes of* STIER'S WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS; *and it is expected that the* CHRISTOLOGY of Dr HENGSTENBERG *will also be finished in* 1858.

# WORKS

OF

# DR JOHN OWEN,

EDITED BY

## REV. DR GOOLD, EDINBURGH.

**In Twenty-four Volumes, 8vo.**

"You will find that in him the learning of Lightfoot, the strength of Charnock, the analysis of Howe, the savour of Leighton, the raciness of Heywood, the glow of Baxter, the copiousness of Barrow, the splendour of Bates are all combined. We should quickly restore the race of great divines if our candidates were disciplined in such lore."—*The late Dr Hamilton of Leeds.*

MESSRS CLARK of Edinburgh beg respectfully to intimate that this great undertaking is now complete, and will in future be published on the following terms:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. The whole Works complete in Twenty-four Volumes, | £6 | 6 | 0 |
| *** When a remittance in advance is made, 10s 6d will be deducted. | | | |
| II. The Miscellaneous Works, Sixteen Vols., . | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| III. The Theologoumena, and some Sermons, One Vol., | 0 | 8 | 6 |
| IV. The Exposition of the Hebrews, Seven Vols., . | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| V. Any Separate Volume, . . . . | 0 | 8 | 6 |

As North British Reviewers, we congratulate our country on having produced this beautiful reprint of the illustrious Puritan; and from the fact that they have offered it at a price which has introduced it to 4000 libraries, we must regard the publishers as benefactors to modern theology. The Editor has consecrated all his learning and all his industry to this labour of love; and, by all accounts, the previous copies needed a reviser as careful and as competent as Dr Goold. Dr Thomson's Memoir of the author we have read with singular pleasure. It exhibits much research, and a fine appreciation of Dr Owen's characteristic excellencies; and its tone is kind and catholic. Such reprints, rightly used, will be a new era in our Christian literature. They can scarcely fail to intensify the devotion and invigorate the faculties of such as read them. And if these readers be chiefly professed divines, the people will in the long run reap the benefit.—*North British Review.*

# CLARK'S

## FOREIGN

# THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVI.

**Keil on the Books of Kings,**

SUPPLEMENTED BY

**Bertheau's Commentary on the Books of Chronicles.**

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET;
LONDON: J. GLADDING; WARD AND CO.; AND JACKSON AND WALFORD.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.

MDCCCLVII.

# COMMENTARY

ON

# THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

BY

KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, D.D. PH.D.,

PROFESSOR OF EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY AND THE ORIENTAL LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF DORPAT.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MURPHY, LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, BELFAST.

SUPPLEMENTED BY

# COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

BY

ERNST BERTHEAU,

PROFESSOR IN GOETTINGEN.

TRANSLATED BY

JAMES MARTIN, B.A.,

EDINBURGH.

VOLUME II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.

DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON, AND HODGES AND SMITH.

MDCCCLVII.

PRINTED BY
ROBERT PARK,
DUNDEE.

# CONTENTS.

## SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.—(*Continued*).

Page.

CHAP. XIII.—Reign of King Jehoahaz, vv. 1—9, and Joash of Israel, vv. 10—13, and 22—25. Death of Elisha, vv. 14—21, . . . . 1

CHAP. XIV.—Reign of Amaziah King of Judah, vv. 1—22, comp. 2 Chr. xxv., and of Jeroboam II. of Israel, vv. 23—29, . . . . 9

CHAP. XV.—Reign of Azariah or Uzziah King of Judah, vv. 1—7, and of several Kings of Israel, vv. 8—38, . . . . . . . 19

CHAP. XVI.—Reign of Ahaz, King of Judah. Comp. 2 Chr. xxviii. . 34

CHAP. XVII.—Reign of Hoshea, the last King of Israel, taking of Samaria and removal of the Israelites to Assyria and Media by Shalmaneser, vv. 1—6; reflections on the fall of the Kingdom of Israel, vv. 7—23; and transplanting of Heathen Colonists into the depopulated territory, vv. 24—41, . . . . . . . . . 50

## SECTION THIRD.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

CHAP. XVIII.—Reign of King Hezekiah, vv. 1—12. Sennacherib's Expedition against Judah and Jerusalem, vv. 13—37, . . . . 78

CHAP. XIX.—Delivery of Jerusalem and liberation of Judah from the Assyrians. Comp. Is. xxxvii., . . . . . . . 93

CHAP. XX.—Sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, vv. 1—11. Arrival of a Babylonian Embassy at Jerusalem, vv. 12—19. Hezekiah's death, vv. 20, 21, . . . . . . . . . . . 112

CHAP. XXI.—Reign of Manasseh, vv. 1—18, comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 1—20; and of Amon, vv. 19—26; comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 21—25, . . . . 123

CHAP. XXII.—XXIII. 30.—Reign of King Josiah, vv. 1, 2; Discovery of the Book of the Law on the occasion of repairing the Temple, vv. 3—20; reading of the Law in the Temple and renewal of the Covenant with the Lord, ch. xxiii. 1—3; abolition of Idolatry and solemnization of the Passover, vv. 4—24; and of Josiah's reign, vv. 25—30, . 131

CHAP. XXIII. 31—XXIV. 17.—Reign of King Jehoahaz, vv. 31-35, of Jehoiakim, v. 36—ch. xxiv. 7, and Jehoiachin, vv. 8—17, . 158

CHAP. XXIV. 18—20 and XXV.—Reign of Zedekiah, and fall of the Kingdom of Judah, ch. xxiv. 18, xxv. 26. Subsequent fate of Jehoiachin, vv. 27—30, . . . . . . . . . . 172

## THE BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES.

Page.

Preface, . . . . . . . . . . . . . 191

### PART I.

Genealogical Tables, . . . . . . . . . . 193

### PART II.

1 Chr. IX. 35 to 2 Chr. XXXVI.

HISTORY OF THE KINGS IN JERUSALEM FROM DAVID TO ZEDEKIAH, THE LAST IN THE SERIES OF KINGS BELONGING TO THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

I.—Chap. IX. 35—Chap. XXIX.—History of David, . . . . 194

1. Chap. IX. 35—Chap. X.—Family of Saul and fate of his house, . 195
2. Chap. XI. 1—9.—David is anointed King in Hebron, and conquers Jerusalem, . . . . . . . . . 201
3. Chap. XI. 10—47.—List of David's heroes, and brief account of their deeds, . . . . . . . . . . . 205
4. Chap. XII. 1—22.—List of those who attached themselves to David during the lifetime of Saul, . . . . . . . 216
5. Chap. XII. 23—40.—Number of the warriors who elected David King in Hebron, . . . . . . . . . . 221
6. Chap. XIII.—XVI.—The Ark of the Covenant is taken to the house of Obed-Edom, and remains there three months, chap. xiii. (account of David's preparations for building a house, of his family, and of his wars with the Philistines, chap. xiv.), the Ark is then carried by the Levites to Jerusalem in a solemn procession, chaps. xv. and xvi., 225
7. Chap. XVII.—Chap. XXII.—David wishes to build a Temple in Jerusalem. He makes the necessary preparations, but the erection of the building itself is left for Solomon. Chaps. xviii.—xxi. form a parenthesis containing accounts of David's wars, his officers, &c., . 251
8. Chap. XXIII.—XXVI.—David makes Solomon King. Division of the Priests and Levites into classes, and appointment of their duties, 298
9. Chap. XXVII.—Account of the army and of David's officers, . 316
10. Chap. XXVIII.—XXIX.—David's last instructions; and his death, 321

---

## SECOND BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES.

II.—Chap. I.—Chap. IX.—History of Solomon, . . . . . 333

1. Chap. I. 1—13.—Solomon offers burnt-offerings in Gibeon; in the night after the sacrifice God appears to him, . . . . 333
2. Chap. I. 14—17.—Solomon's chariots, horsemen, and wealth, . 337
3. Chap. II.—VII.—The building of the Temple and other things connected with it, . . . . . . . . . . 337
4. Chap. VIII. and IX.—Brief notices of important events in Solomon's Reign, account of his wisdom, his wealth, and his power. His death, 346

III.—Chap. X.—Chap. XXXVI.—History of the Kings who reigned in Jerusalem, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah, . . . . . 355

Page.

1. Chap. X.—XII.—Rise of the Southern and Northern Kingdoms. History of Rehoboam, . . . . . . . 356
2. Chap. XIII.—Abijah, . . . . . . . 363
3. Chap. XIV.—Chap. XVI.—Asa, . . . . . . 368
4. Chap. XVII.—Chap. XXI. 1.—Jehoshaphat, . . . 381
5. Chap. XXI. 2—20.—Jehoram, . . . . . . . 398
6. Chap. XXII. 1—9.—Ahaziah, . . . . . . . 400
7. Chap. XXII. 10.—XXIII. 21.—Athaliah, Ahaziah's Mother, . 402
8. Chap. XXIV.—Joash, . . . . . . . . 403
9. Chap. XXV.—Amaziah, . . . . . . . 406
10. Chap. XXVI.—Uzziah, . . . . . . . . 409
11. Chap. XXVII.—Jotham, . . . . . . . 414
12. Chap. XXVIII.—Ahaz, . . . . . . . 415
13. Chap. XXIX.—XXXII.—Hezekiah, . . . . . . 422
14. Chap. XXXIII. 1—20.—Manasseh, . . . . . . 444
15. Chap. XXXIII. 21—25.—Amon, . . . . . . 446
16. Chap. XXXIV. and XXXV.—Josiah, . . . . . 446
17. Chap. XXXVI. 1—4.—Jehoahaz, . . . . . . 456
18. Chap. XXXVI. 5—8.—Jehoiakim, . . . . . . 457
19. Chap. XXXVI. 9, 10.—Jehoiachin, . . . . . . 460
20. Chap. XXXVI. 11—21.—Zedekiah, . . . . . . 461

# SECOND BOOK OF KINGS.

---

## CHAPTER XIII.

REIGN OF KING JEHOAHAZ, VV. 1—91, AND JOASH OF ISRAEL; VV. 10—13, and 22—25. DEATH OF ELISHA, VV. 14—21.

V. 1. "In the 23d year of Joash, king of Judah, Jehoahaz became king over Israel in Samaria seventeen years." This statement is in contradiction with v. 10, and does not agree well with earlier synchronistic statements. If Jehoahaz became king in the 23d year of Joash, king of Judah, and reigned seventeen years, his son Joash cannot after his death have succeeded him on the throne in the 37th year of Joash of Judah, as is stated v. 10. For even should we assume with Vatabl., Grot., Calm., and others, that Joash became king in the very beginning of the 23d year, and his son Jehoahaz only at the close of the 37th year of king Joash of Judah, Jehoahaz would still not have reigned full fifteen years, which could not possibly be counted as seventeen years: since, if the beginning of his reign fell in the beginning of the year, his first year would exactly agree with the 23d year of Joash, whereby the 37th of Joash of Judah must have coincided at least in part with the fourteenth of his reign. The solution of Ussher (*Annal. m. ad a.m.* 3163), Lightfoot (*Opp.* i. 90), Budd. (*hist. eccl.* ii. 401 f.), Seb. Schm. and several Rabbins (comp. Meyer *Annott. ad Sed. ol.* p. 944), that Jehoahaz had assumed his son Joash as co-regent two or three years before his death, appears at once to be a make-shift, and a product of the difficulty, as it contradicts the clear words of vv.

9 and 10, according to which Joash became king only after his father's death. Our statement, however, is at variance not only with v. 10, but with xii. 2. For as Jehu ascended the throne at the same time with Athaliah, and Joash of Judah became king in the seventh year of Jehu, according to which Athaliah reigned nearly six full years; the end of the twenty-eight years' reign of Jehu (x. 36) must fall in the 22d year of Joash of Judah, unless we choose to assume, contrary to the fixed principle of our author, to reckon the incomplete years as complete, that Jehu reigned longer than twenty-eight years, or to agree to the improbable assumption of Seb. Schm., that between the death of Jehu, and the commencement of the reign of his successor, several weeks or months elapsed. All these difficulties and contradictions disappear, as soon as we assume an error in our verse, and put instead of the 23d the 22d year of Joash. Then Jehu reigned twenty-seven years and some months, which as in all the other kings are stated as twenty-eight years, and Jehoahaz may have reigned from the 22d to the 37th year of Joash of Judah from fifteen to nearly sixteen years, which, according to the principle above developed in the introduction to 1 Ki. xii., namely to reckon the years of the kings according to Nisan, and thus count the weeks and months before as well as after Nisan as full years, would make out a reign of seventeen years.[1]

Vv. 2—9. As Joash, walking wholly in the footsteps of his predecessors, continued the illegal calf-worship introduced by Jero-

[1] Instead of the number twenty-three we might also put twenty-one; for as the first year of the Jewish Joash coincides with the seventh of Jehu (xii. 1), the beginning of the twenty-eighth year of Jehu might possibly fall in the end of the twenty-first year of the Jewish Joash. The reign of Jehoahaz continuing from the twenty-first to the thirty-seventh year of Joash might then still more easily be said to amount to seventeen years. So Josephus has amended our text (Ant. ix. 8, 5); for that he should have found this number in it is not a probable supposition, for this reason, that the LXX., as well as all the old versions, agree with the Masoretic text in the number twenty-three. *Des Vignoles* (chronol. i. p. 347 ff.) and Winer (R.W. i. 687 f.) assume an error in v. 10, referring to the fact that the date contained in v. 1 harmonizes with the duration of Jehu's reign, but in v. 10 the LXX. have, according to *edit. Ald.*, actually thirty-nine instead of thirty-seven. But in reference to v. 1 we have above in the text proved the contrary, and the reading of the *edit. Ald.* of the LXX. in v. 10 is nothing more than an arbitrary emendation of no critical import.

boam (v. 2), the Lord chastised Israel still more under his reign than under his predecessor Jehu. The longer the sin was continued, the greater the revolt, so much the severer must have been the punishment. The instruments the Lord employed as scourges for Israel were Hazael and his son Benhadad, who oppressed the kingdom of Israel so severely that only 50 horsemen, 10 chariots, and 10,000 footmen were left to Jehoahaz. When, as the oppression rose to the highest, Jehoahaz besought the Lord and was heard, God the Lord gave Israel a saviour, so that they were released from the hand of the Syrians, and again dwelt peacefully in their tents as before time, although they departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, and the Asherah also stood in Samaria.—On the sing. suff. in מִמֶּנָּה, v. 2 and בָּהּ v. 6 comp. on iii. 3. The change of בָּהּ into בָּם in Dathe is arbitrary. V. 3. כָּל־הַיָּמִים "the whole time," namely, of the reign of Jehoahaz. Many expositors limit these words: *nearly*, almost during his whole reign (Seb. Sch., J. D., Mich., d. exeg. Hand.); but vv. 4 and 5 do not warrant this. The saviour (מוֹשִׁיעַ v. 5) given to the kingdom of Israel at the prayer of Jehoahaz is neither an angel, nor the prophet Elisha, as some think, nor *quidam e ducibus Joasi* (Seb. Schm., Budd. *h. eccl.* ii. 402), nor are we to understand thereby a victory gained by Jehoahaz over the Syrians, but the Lord gave Israel a saviour in the two successors of Jehoahaz, in the kings Joash and Jeroboam, of whom the former recovered from the Syrians all the cities taken from his father (v. 25), the latter restored the old boundaries of Israel (xiv. 25.) For that Israel did not obtain deliverance from the Syrian yoke under Jehoahaz, but that the Lord had mercy on them first under Joash and Jeroboam, and by these kings granted them victory over their enemies, is said in the most explicit manner in vv. 22—25 and xiv. 26 f. According to these clear expressions must the indefinite statements of vv. 4 and 5 be understood, especially as the reference of the passages quoted to these verses cannot be mistaken. But from the comparison of those passages with our verses it follows at the same time that the oppression which, according to v. 3, Hazael's son Benhadad exercised over Israel falls in the time of his father's reign, and thus that Benhadad is named, not as king, but as general under his father Hazael. For,

according to v. 24, the alleviation of the Syrian yoke took place simultaneously with the death of Hazael, who died, not under Jehoahaz but under Joash, whereupon Joash wrested their conquests again from the Syrians. Therefore also in v. 4 only a מֶלֶךְ אֲרָם is mentioned. Concerning חִלָּה פְּנֵים (v. 4) see on 1 Ki. xiii. 6. When it is said, v. 4, "God heard him," we may not surely, with Meyer, *ad Sed. Ol.* p. 943, affirm the contrary: *iratam faciem Domini quidem deprecatus est, sed non exauditus*, but certainly assume, that the hearing did not take place immediately, that is, the aid did not come under him, but under his son, as the phrase כָּל־הַיָּמִים (v. 3) and v. 22 ff. imperatively demand. וַיֵּצְאוּ מִתַּחַת "they went out from under the hand of Aram," that is, they were released from the power of the Syrians, were delivered from their oppression, and attained again to the enjoyment of the blessings of peace. "And the children of Israel dwelt (sat) in their tents as yesterday and ere yesterday," that is, they were able to dwell again in peace in their houses as formerly, without being driven out and carried away by their enemies.—V. 6. בָּהּ הָלָךְ "therein (in the sin of Jeroboam) walked *he*," that is, Jehoahaz, or *it*, that is, Israel. Concerning the form הֶחֱטִי, which Hitzig (Begr. d. krit. p. 135) unnecessarily explains as an error of transcription, compare on 1 Ki. xxi. 21; on the אֲשֵׁרָה see on 1 Ki. xiv. 23. This idol had probably remained from Ahab's times (1 Ki. xvi. 33) as its destruction by Jehu is not mentioned.—V. 7 has given much trouble to the expositors. C. a Lap. wished to connect it with v. 3 and place it before v. 4. Houbigant and Dathe have actually placed it after v. 4. כִּי must, according to Schulz and the exeg. Hdb. *plane abundare*, according to Cler., signify *sed*. All this is arbitrary. The verse stands in its right place, כִּי means for, and is in substance attached to vv. 4 and 5, while v. 6 contains only a thought subordinate to v. 5, for which reason Seb. Schm. would put it in a parenthesis. The connection of thoughts is simply[1] this: Jehoa-

[1] Maurer has determined the order of thought in vv. 6 and 7 much too artificially, and even falsely thus: *tamen non recesserunt a peccatis Jerobeami cet. tamen constanter neglexerunt Jovam, vs. 7. nam Jova facta facere infecta non poterat, Israelitis tantum imbecillum auxilium tulerat.*

haz besought the Lord, and the Lord heard him, for he saw their oppression . . . . and gave them a saviour . . . . although they departed not from their sins (v. 6); for Israel was come to an extremity; he (Jehovah) had left to Jehoahaz not more than fifty horsemen . . . . for the king of the Syrians had destroyed them (the remaining horsemen, chariots, and footmen.) That "he had made them like the dust in threshing," denotes their total annihilation, Is. xxi. 10; Mic. iv. 12 f.; Jer. li. 33. The figurative expression here, however, had contained partly a literal truth; for according to Am. i. 3, Hazael had drawn threshing instruments of iron over the Gileadites, according to a barbaric custom of war, of which examples occur elsewhere, comp. 2 Sam. viii. 31; Judg. viii. 7.

Vv. 10—13.—*The beginning, duration, and character of the reign of Joash* (יוֹאָשׁ or יְהוֹאָשׁ) *in Israel.* On the beginning of his reign see the remarks on v. 1.—On v. 11 comp. v. 2 and 6.—The war of Joash with Amaziah, indicated v. 12, is related xiv. 8—14. The standing formula for the end of every reign is, in the case of Joash, placed too early in vv. 12 and 13, and recurs in xiv. 15 f., interwoven with the history of the reign of the Jewish king, there still less suitably, although it stands here in the wrong place, and should properly follow at the close of the chapter.

Vv. 14—19. Under Joash "Elisha fell sick of his sickness whereof he was to die." *Quemadmodum unicuique homini suus morbus et mors destinata; sic etiam Elisa tandem juxta sortem generis humani aegrotavit lethaliter; estque tacita oppositio inter ipsum et Eliam, qui vivus in cœlum ascendit.* Seb. Schm. On the news of the mortal sickness of the prophet, the king came down to him,—the place where Elisha lay sick and died is not named,—and "wept over his face." These words are certainly not with Cler., Schulz, and others, to be thus understood: *dum eum jacentem oscularetur, lacrimas profudit,* but merely to be taken in the sense, he wept standing before him, literally, over him lying. The king believed that after the death of the prophet he must encounter the danger threatening his kingdom from the Syrians, and therefore exclaims, "My father, my father! the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Comp. in regard

to these words on ii. 12. From this lamentation of the king over the approaching death of the prophet, it appears that Joash was not altogether without trust and faith. *Serias*, Seb. Schm. rightly remarks, *putamus fuisse has lacrimas, nec hypocriticas nisi quod non perrexerit in seria poenitentia.* This faith, though weak, the Lord accepted and comforted him by a cheering promise of the dying prophet. In order to help the weak faith of the king, the promise is connected with a symbolic action. "Take bow and arrows, lay thy hand upon the bow, open the window eastward and shoot," said Elisha to him, and after the king had taken the bow in his hand, laid his hands upon the hands of the king in token of the power granted to the bow-shot coming from the Lord through the medium of the prophet, and added on the discharge of the arrow: "An arrow of deliverance from the Lord and an arrow of deliverance against the Syrians! and thou wilt smite the Syrians in Aphek to destruction." The discharged arrow was to be a symbol of the help of the Lord against the Syrians to their utter overthrow. This promise the king was now by his own act to appropriate. Elisha therefore desired him to shoot the remaining arrows to the ground, and the king did so, but stopped after shooting the third arrow, and thereby displayed the weakness of his faith. For when it was said to him, that the discharged arrow signified a victory over the Syrians, it was evident of itself that the more arrows he shot, the greater deliverance, the more victories would he obtain. When, therefore, he stopped so soon, the reason could only lie in this, that he, doubting the omnipotence of God to fulfil his promise, regarded three victories as the *maximum*, which the Lord could or would give him.[1] The prophet, therefore, was justly indignant with the weak faith of the king, and declared to him that he had only by the unbelief he had herein displayed, deprived himself of the complete victory over the Syrians. By this distinction between the objective promise and its subjective appropriation, the apparent contradiction between v. 17 and 19 disappears,

[1] *Cum rex apud animum suum potentiam Syriae regum reputaret, nec fidem prorsus haberet Elisaeo, satis esse credidit, si ter feriret terram, veritus ut vaticinium impleretur, si plures ictus terrae impingeret. Cler.*

which S. Schm. and Cler. endeavoured to explain in a very unsatisfactory manner by referring עַד־כַּלֵּה (v. 17) *sensu strictiori* to the army of the Syrians, in v. 19 on the contrary *sensu latiori* to the kingdom and nation of the Syrians. The arrow shot through the window under the laying on of Elisha's hands symbolized the promise objectively made to Joash, the arrows shot by Joash at the word of the prophet to the ground, represented the subjective appropriation of this promise.[1]—V. 16. הַרְכֵּב יָדְךָ עַל הקֹ׳ "lay thine hand upon the bow." הִרְכִּיב to cause to ride, go, then, to load (2 Sam. vi. 3), accordingly here, to lay on, as more frequently in Syr. and Arab. Comp. *L. de Dieu ad h. l.* and Ges. *thes.* iii. 1287.—V. 17. "Open the window eastward, or toward the east," probably with reference to this, that the Syrians had established themselves in the East, had taken all Gilead, x. 32 f. תְּשׁוּעָה salvation, see on v. 1. בַּאֲרָם in, upon Aram, that is, towards Aram, comp. Ew. Gr. § 521.—On the situation of Aphek comp. on 1 Ki. xx. 26.—V. 18. הַךְ אַרְצָה "smite on the earth," that is, shoot the arrow to the earth. Comp. on this meaning of הִכָּה, iii. 25, ix. 24; 1 Ki. xxii. 34; 1 Sam. xvii. 49 f.—V. 19. לְהַכּוֹת, to smite, it behoved thee to smite . . . , then wouldst thou . . . Comp. Ew. Gr. § 544.

Vv. 20, 21. Even after his death Elisha was proved by a miracle to be a prophet of the Lord, in order to put the seal upon the truth of his announcements, especially his last still unfulfilled prediction concerning the conquest of the Syrians, comp. Sir. 48, 12—14. In the next year after the death of Elisha the inhabitants of the city, in the vicinity of which the prophet was buried, brought out a dead man to bury him. By the way they saw a marauding party of Moabites advancing, and opened, in order to retreat from them as speedy as possible, the grave of Elisha, which was at hand, and put the body into it with all haste. But as soon as the deceased touched the body of Elisha, he revived and stood up on his feet. Among the

[1] Quite arbitrary is the conjecture of Köster (i. p. q. p. 98): "perhaps the plurality of arrows is intended, as in the well-known story of the dying father, to express the harmony of the two kingdoms."

Israelites the dead were neither enclosed in coffins nor covered with earth, but only wrapt in linen cloth and laid in tombs, so that one body might touch another, and, on returning to life, would not be hindered from moving. Now, with regard to this miracle, it was not the dead body of Elisha, but the living God, that gave life again to the dead; and the effect of the Divine omnipotence was only brought about by contact with the dead Elisha, and was connected with him, because God wished thereby to show his people, that the Divine efficiency that was at work in Elisha had not disappeared from Israel with his death. The special object of the miracle indeed was this, to convince in the most effectual manner people and king of the truth of the promise of the victory over the Syrians, which the dying Elisha had announced to king Joash by the laying of his hands upon the hands of the king.[1] The narrator intimates this object, when immediately after the account of this miracle he records the historical fulfilment of that promise (vv. 22—25.) The difficult בָּה שָׁנָה is mostly rendered with Maurer, "the year came," for, "when the year came." The LXX. and Chald. express this sense; on the contrary the Vulg. and Syr., *in ipso anno*, as if they had read בַּשָּׁנָה. At all events Ewald's explanation is to be rejected; "they were wont to come in the coming of the year (בֹּא *infin.*), a yearly coming" (Krit. Gr. p. 528), less on account of the change of text, as on account of the sense not suiting the context.—וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ means not, "they cast," as if they had flung the body into the grave, but, they deposited it with all haste.—The phrase וַיֵּלֶךְ belongs to the descriptive, as it were pictorial style, the dead came and touched = as the dead came to the bones of Elisha, he touched them. Quite unsuitable

[1] Many from Ephraim Syr. and Pseudo-epiphan. *de proph. c.* 6 to Köster erroneously assign as the object of this miracle, to show that Elisha even in the grave surpassed his master Elijah in miraculous power, or that he was able to do wonders in the grave, because he possessed the spirit of Elijah in a twofold measure. But the spirit and object of this miracle are completely mistaken by the rationalists, who with Bauer (hebr. Mythol. ii. p. 197), the exeg. Hdb. and Jahn (Einl. ii. 1, p. 261) pronounce the deceased to be one apparently dead, who, when he was cast into Elisha's grave, was brought to his senses and restored to animation by the rough shock of the severe fall.

therefore is the conjecture of Hitzig וְתֵּלְכוּ (Begr. d. Krit. p. 127.)

Vv. 22—25. With v. 22 comp. vv. 4 and 7 and the remarks there. *Reassumitur hoc de Chasaele ad exponendum complementum prophetiae Elisæ.* V. 23 ff. On account of his covenant made with the patriarchs, the Lord did not yet reject Israel from his sight, as they certainly deserved by their obstinate rebellion against him, but now again averted the impending destruction from them by the death of Hazael. For his son and successor Benhadad was three times defeated by Joash, as Elisha had promised, and must have surrendered to the Israelites all the cities conquered by his father under Jehoahaz. The cities which Hazael took from Jehoahaz are not named; even under Jehu he had conquered all Gilead (x. 33), under Jehoahaz probably also a part of the country on this side of the Jordan, as he had carried away almost his whole army (v. 7.) Joash recovered these cities from him, his son Jeroboam Gilead also, comp. xiv. 25.

---

## CHAPTER XIV.

### REIGN OF AMAZIAH KING OF JUDAH, VV. 1—22, COMP. 2 CHR. XXV., AND OF JEROBOAM II. OF ISRAEL, VV. 23—29.

Vv. 1—4. Amaziah comes to the sovereignty in the second year of Joash king of Israel. As according to xiii. 10 (comp. our remarks on xiii. 1) Joash of Israel became king towards the end of the thirty-seventh year of Joash of Judah, Amaziah can only have ascended the throne in the second year of Joash of Israel, if his father Joash did not reign thirty-nine full years. Now his reign is certainly, xii. 1, stated at forty years; but these forty years may, according to the above-mentioned principle of our author to give the current years as complete, have amounted only to 38½ or 38¾, in case that Joash attained to the sovereignty a couple of months before Nisan, and his death again occurred a few months after Nisan. There is, therefore, no need of the hypothesis of a co-regency, which is in no way

indicated in the text, though employed by C. a Lap., Seb. Schm., Light (Opp. i. 90) and others.—V. 3 f. Amaziah's reign was theocratic, though it was not like David's, but resembled that of his father Joash, that is, it began well and ended badly. Both kings fell into idolatry in the latter years of their sovereignty. Concerning Joash, see on xii. 3; but Amaziah worshipped the idols of the Edomites, 2 Chr. xxv. 14 ff., he is therefore, 2 Chr. xxv. 2, characterized quite correctly, "he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, only not with a wholly devoted heart;" see my apol. Vers. p. 383.

Vv. 5, 6. After Amaziah had confirmed his kingdom, he avenged the death of his father by the execution of his murderers, but adhered therein to the law of Moses, and did not put to death their children, as no doubt often occurred and was quite customary in antiquity, comp. Hävern. Comm. on Dan. p. 224 and Mich., Mos. R.V. p. 2 ff., because the law (Deut. xxiv. 16) prescribed, "The father shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin.[1] The change of יָמוּת into יוּמַת (*Keri*) according to Deut. is to be rejected on critical grounds.

V. 7. The brief notice of the conquest of the Edomites in the valley of Salt, and the taking of the town Selah, is completed by 2 Chr. xxv. 6—16, whence we learn, that Amaziah wished to strengthen his own very considerable force for this war by 100,000 mercenary troops from Israel, but at the warning of a prophet sent back the hired Israelites, whereupon they in anger plundered several cities of Judah and slew many men, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 299 and 447.—Under Joram the Edomites, whom David had also defeated in the valley of Salt and then subjugated (2 Sam. viii. 13 f.: 1 Chr. xviii. 10 f.), had revolted from the supremacy of Judah (viii. 20 ff.) Amaziah undertook to reduce them again under his sway, and succeeded so far, that he totally routed their army and took their capital, so that his successor Uzziah was able to incorporate the Edomite seaport Elath

[1] The poor evasion, with which de Wette (Beitr. i. 167) endeavoured to set aside the force of this direct reference to the law of Moses as a proof of the existence of the Pentateuch under Amaziah, Hertz. i. p. q. p. 87 ff., has already estimated at its worth. Comp. also Hävern. i. 2, p. 596.

again into his kingdom (v. 22.) גֵּי הַמֶּלַח for גֵּיא הַמֶּלַח (2 Chr. xxv. 11) the salt-vale is the Ghor adjacent to the great salt-hill, two and a half hours long, Khashm Usdum خشم اسدم in the south of the Dead Sea, which separated the territories of Judah and Edom (comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 24 f.). הַסֶּלַע ἡ *Πέτρα* the city Selah or Petra was most probably the capital of the Edomites, as also from the fourth century before Christ of the Nabatheans, and afterwards of *Arabia Petraea*, a great and flourishing commercial town, which is also from the fourth to the sixth century of the Christian era named as the metropolitan church of *Paluestina tertia.* It derives its name *rock* from its situation and mode of architecture. According to Strabo (xvi. 4, 21) it lay "on a place otherwise flat and level, but surrounded by rocks, rising steeply from without, but furnished within with copious fountains for daily use and for watering the gardens" (similarly Plinius in Rob. iii. p. 131), on the east side of the Ghor leading to the Elanitic gulf, about two long days' journey distant from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. Its former glory is attested by the many splendid ruins, which still exist under the name Wady Musa, and were first discovered in modern times by Burckhardt (Reis. ii. p. 703 ff.), afterwards by Irby and Mangles, Laborde, and others, and also visited and described by Rob. (iii. p. 60 ff.)[1] In the taking of Selah the remaining part of the Edomite army, 10,000 men, was probably taken captive and cast down from the top of the rock which was round the city (2 Chr. xxv. 12.)[2] The name יָקְתְאֵל *a Deo subactum, in servi-*

[1] On the identity of the ruins of Wady Musa, called "*Vallis Moysi*" even by the Crusaders, with the ancient Petra, comp. Rob. iii. p. 128 ff., where the historical notices of this city are admirably collected, and p. 760 ff., where the questions concerning the various names given to Petra, and concerning the transference of the name Petra to other places, are discussed with great profoundness. Burckhardt in the p. q. at p. 704 has given a plan of these ruins; that designed by Laborde is still better, which is also adopted in the map of Arabia belonging to Robinson's Palestine.

[2] Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 81) wishes without necessity to correct this statement of Chr. by the assumption of the writing of עֲשֶׂרֶת אֲלָפִים being repeated through neglect; for which there is so much

*tutem redactum* (comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1244), which Amaziah applied to the city, was naturally retained only so long as the city remained in the power of the Jews, that is, till the time of Ahaz (xvi. 6), and therefore does not again occur. Joktheel signifies, moreover, also a city in the tribe of Judah, Jos. xv. 38. The phrase עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה proves, therefore, that the history of Amaziah was written, if not in his time, at least very soon after his death.

Vv. 8—10. After the conquest of the Edomites, Amaziah engaged in a war with Joash of Israel, which had an unfortunate issue for him. The external occasion of it, which is not mentioned in our narrative, was probably given, as the Rabbins supposed, by the hostilities committed against Judah by the dismissed mercenary troops of Israel (2 Chr. xxv. 13); but the proper and deeper ground was pride and insolence, which Amaziah, in consequence of his victory over the Edomites, allowed to steal upon him and carry him so far that he not only, forgetting the Lord his God, to whom alone he owed this victory, worshipped the Edomite idols taken in war as gods, and by threats reduced to silence the prophet who censured this idolatry (2 Chr. xxv. 14 ff.), but also, in the proud confidence of his might, challenged Joash the king of Israel to war. The historian has omitted even the professed external ground of this challenge, but has sufficiently discovered the internal ground by the statement as well of the haughty challenge, "Come, let us look one another in the face," as also of the answer of Joash warning him of his arrogance (vv. 9, 10.)—The phrase הִתְרָאוּ פָנִים *adspexerunt sibi vultus* corresponds to the German expression, to view heads, to measure one with another, that is, to engage in combat with one another. This signification has رَأَى vi. in Arab., comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1247.—Joash admonishes his proud adversary with a fable, as Jotham once similarly instructed his fellow-citizens (Judg. ix. 8 ff.) The fable of the brier (v. 9) is not to be so ex-

the less reason, as according to his own confession (p. 259) this whole section of Chronicles is not taken from our Books of Kings, as he has been pleased to assume with regard to the other parallel sections. To the suspicion thrown on this narrative of Chronicles on the part of Gramberg, Movers p. 259 has moreover replied as it deserved.

plained in detail, that by the brier we should directly understand Amaziah, by the cedar Joash, and by the wild beast the warriors or the war, or suppose, with Dereser, that Amaziah had sought a daughter of Joash in marriage for one of his sons and employed the refusal as a pretext for war; for with reason Seb. Schm. has remarked, *existimo non omnia in applicatione adhibenda*, and thus explained the fable: *rubus s. spina ad cedrum mittens est homo superbia elatus ; petitio filiae cedri est res indigna postulatu ; conculcatio a bestiis agri scil. per cedrum immissis est ingens calamitas temere adscita.* Correct on the whole ; only we must regard the desire of a daughter of the cedar as a wife for his son on the part of the brier more correctly as an ambition going beyond the bounds of his own standing and power, and omit the addition, *per cedrum immissis*, introduced into the parable by Schm. The trampling of the brier by a wild beast, is to teach the fall and ruin, which, unexpectedly, overtake the haughty in the midst of his highflown schemes. V. 10 contains the application of the fable.—נְשָׂאֲךָ לִבֶּךָ *animus te tollit*, that is, thy courage is raised, thou art proudly uplifted, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 915. הִכָּבֵד "be honoured," that is, *habeto tibi hunc honorem, sis eo contentus.* Maur.—"Why wilt thou meddle with misfortune." הִתְגָּרָה to engage in strife, war, comp. Deut. ii. 5, 9, 19, 24, etc. So also here, where misfortune (רָעָה) is regarded as the foe, with which one is engaged in strife, as Winer (*lex.* p. 195) has rightly observed.

Vv. 11—14. Yet Amaziah in his arrogance regarded this warning as little as the representation of the prophet, that, on account of his revolt from the Lord, God had determined to destroy him (2 Chr. xxv. 16), and according to the Divine foreordination (2 Chr. xxv. 20) engaged in war. But Joash anticipating him, invaded Judah, and at Bethshemesh, (comp. on this city above, p. 46), not only put his army to route, but took himself captive, marched to Jerusalem, broke down a considerable part of the city walls, plundered the treasures of the temple and palace, and returned with hostages to Samaria. V. 13. "And he brake down the wall of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim to the corner gate 400 cubits," that is, about the half of the northern wall. For the gate of Ephraim lay at all events on the

north side of the city, on the way to Ephraim, and is also called the gate of Benjamin, Jer. xxxvii. 13, xxxviii. 7, Zech. xiv. 10, because the way to Ephraim went over the land of Benjamin, comp. Faber. Arch. i. p. 333 f. and Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 375. It is no doubt to be sought in the region of the present Damascus gate, comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 377.—V. 14. בְּנֵי הַתַּעֲרֻבוֹת, which the old translators (LXX. τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν συμμίξεων, Syr. ܒܢܝ̈ ܚܘܠܛܢܐ *filii commixtionis i. e. gens promiscua*, Arab. بني عروبا, and Chald. בְּנֵי רַבְרְבַיָּא *filii Magnatum*) did not rightly understand, means *obsides*, the hostages (see Ges. *thes.* ii. 1064), namely, those who must have been given to Joash for the liberation of Amaziah. This liberation of the king, indeed, is not expressly mentioned, but it necessarily follows from this that Joash did not take him with him to Samaria, but Amaziah remained king in Jerusalem, and outlived Joash about fifteen years (v. 17.)

Vv. 15—22. In vv. 15 and 16, the author of our books repeats the end of the reign of Joash with the standing formula from xiii. 12 f., *ut ostendat, Amatsiam ei supervixisse laudetque divinam misericordiam, quae tamen Amatsiam non plane perdere voluerit, abrepto ex hac vita Joaso.* Seb. Schm.—V. 17, comp. 2 Chr. xxv. 25.—V. 19. Several ancient expositors discover the cause of the conspiracy against Amaziah in the unfortunate issue of his war with Joash. But this hypothesis would only have gained probability if the conspiracy had broken out soon after the departure of Joash. Some indeed believed this, and appealed to 2 Chr. xxv. 27, where it is said, "after the time that Amaziah turned away from the Lord, they made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem," (comp. Mich. *annot. uber. ad h. l.* and Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. 408), but it only follows from this that the conspiracy had its internal ground in the revolt of Amaziah from the Lord, the evil consequences of which appeared in the unfortunate war with Joash, but not that it broke out at that time, that Amaziah was forthwith removed and exiled to Lachish, and that the government in Jerusalem was committed to his son. For it is at once very improbable in itself, that Amaziah being removed from the throne, lived fifteen years in peace at Lachish, and then first

made an attempt to recover the sovereignty, in which he was slain; and then, if this had actually taken place, it should have been recorded of Uzziah, as well as in xv. 5 of Jotham, that he governed the kingdom during the time of his father's deposition. But neither in v. 22 nor in xv. 8 is the least intimation of this found. We must therefore assume that the conspiracy broke out first towards the end of the twenty-nine years' reign of Amaziah, that Amaziah indeed escaped to Lachish, but was immediately put to death by the conspirators sent thither after him, whereupon they brought his body to Jerusalem, and there buried it, while his son Uzziah was made king by the people in his stead.—לָכִישׁ Lachish, a Canaanitish royal city (Jos. x. 3—31, xii. 11) in the lowlands of Judah (Jos. xv. 39), fortified by Rehoboam (2 Chr. xi. 9), afterwards taken by Sennacherib (2 Ki. xviii. 14—17; 2 Chr. xxxii. 9), lay, according to Eusebius, seven Roman miles south of Eleutheropolis (comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 207), and is irrecoverably lost, as the ruins Um Lakis (ام لاقس) are not identical with the old Lachish, see Rob. Pal. ii. p. 653 f. "They brought him עַל־הַסּוּסִים on the horses," that is, on a chariot drawn by the king's horses, to Jerusalem.—V. 21. עֲזַרְיָה or עֲזַרְיָהוּ Azariah (v. 21, xv. 1, 6, 8, 17, 23, 27,) is called in v. 13, 30, 32; 2 Chr. xxvi. 1, 3, 11 etc.; Is. i. 1, vi. 1; Am. i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5 עֻזִּיָּהוּ or עֻזִּיָּה Uzziah. Some expositors regard עזריה as an error of the pen arising out of עזיה, which however, on account of the frequency of the name, is destitute of probability. We must rather assume that the king actually had both names, which are closely related in signification; עֻזִּיָּה means *potentia Jovae*, עזריה *quem Jova adjuvit;* as the Oriental names are so changeable. Comp. on 1 Ki. xv. 2. —V. 22. Immediately after his father's death Uzziah (Azariah) fortified the Edomite seaport Elath or Eloth (see on 1 Ki. ix. 26) and restored it to Judah; comp. the remarks on v. 7. From the words, "after that the king slept with his fathers," we cannot with Jarchi, Abarb. (comp. Meyer *annot. ad Sed. Ol.* p. 950) and Seb. Schm. infer, that Uzziah had attained to the sovereignty before the death of Amaziah; the words merely state that Uzziah completed the reduction of the Edomites, com-

menced by his father immediately after his death by the conquest of Elath.

Vv. 23—29. Reign of Jeroboam II. of Israel. Jeroboam adhered to the antitheocratical image worship of his father (v. 24), but raised his kingdom to great political power, inasmuch as he restored its original boundaries, and continuing the conquests of his father, recovered all the conquered territory from the Syrians, v. 25, comp. with xiii. 25. מִלְּבוֹא חֲמָת was the northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah under Solomon, comp. 1 Ki. viii. 65. יָם הָעֲרָבָה "sea of the plain" is the Salt or Dead Sea. This line of boundary is taken from Deut. iii. 17, iv. 49, which the prophet Jonah follows in his announcements, comp. Hengstenb. Beitr. ii., p. 140.[1] Jonah the son of Amittai is the same prophet, the history of whose predictions concerning Nineveh are preserved for us in the book of Jonah ; comp. de Wette, Einl. p. 330), and Hävern. Einl. ii. 2, p. 324 f. גַּת הַחֵפֶר Gath-hepher belonging to the tribe of Zebulon (Jos. xix. 13), and according to Hieron., situated two Roman miles from Sepphoris towards Tiberias (see v. Raum. p. 125) is according to modern monastic tradition preserved in the village el Meshchad (المشهد), where one of the many Moslemite graves of the Neby Yunas is shown (Rob. Pal. iii. p. 449.)—Vv. 26 and 27 assign the reasons why the Lord granted to the antitheocratically disposed Jeroboam so great power for the restoration of the old boundaries of the land formerly determined by Moses. This took place, because the Lord saw the heavy oppression and helpless condition of Israel, and had not yet pronounced the decree for the extirpation of the kingdom of the ten tribes, and thus had not yet annulled his covenant with the apostate people (xiii. 23.) עָנִי מֹרֶה most explain after the old versions, "bitter affliction." Coccei., J. H. Mich., and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 818), however, adhere to the usual meaning of

[1] By this reference to the quoted passages of the Pentateuch the inference drawn by Credner (in Ullm. u. Umbr.'s theol. Stud. 1833, p. 3, p. 785) and Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 181 f.) from our verse, namely, that Jeroboam subjugated again the territory of the Moabites, is proved to be unfounded: for from this it is evident, that he merely incorporated again with his kingdom the Israelitish territory as far as the Arnon, the river of the plain (Am. vi. 14.)

מֻרָה *contumax, pervicax,* as much as to say, *insanabilis.* But it must be evident, that the former meaning suits better, on which account we assume, that מרה here takes its signification from מרר, for which the language presents so many analogies: though מרר Ex. xxiii. 21 occurs also in the signification of מרה; for Cler. has justly remarked, מָרָה (*faem.* of מַר) *amarus est doloris et moeroris frequentissimum epitheton, cum מֹרָה dolor nusquam dicatur.* וְאֶפֶס עָצוּר וגו' "and all is gone, bond and free." de Wette. On this phrase borrowed from the Pentateuch see on 1 Ki. xiv. 10. Israel was sunk down to the helpless misery predicted by Moses, Deut. xxxii. 16; therefore the Lord helped them, as His servant Moses had then promised them, that they might perceive that their idols could afford no deliverance, and might acknowledge the Lord alone as their God, Deut. xxxii. 37—42. —The words, v. 28, כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵשִׁיב וגו' "and how he recovered Damascus and Hamath of Judah to Israel," have given much trouble to the old expositors, inasmuch as they took לִיהוּדָה for a dative and (as de Wette still does) rendered, "how he brought Damascus and Hamath to Judah through Israel," whereby no tolerable sense is elicited, as we shall be convinced by the attempted explanations collected by Seb. Schm.[1] ליהודה is a periphrasis for the genitive, and was correctly explained by Cler. *quæ olim Judæ fuerant.* It might still be a question, whether it is to be referred merely to חֲמָת, "the Jewish Hamath" (Mich.) or also to דַּמֶּשֶׂק (Cler. and others.) The former is obviously the correct supposition. Jeroboam might certainly recover Damascus, but not the city Hamath (Ἐπιφάνεια on the Orontes) to Israel, because the latter never belonged to the kingdom of Israel, as was proved above p. 134. But David had conquered Damascus and made Damascene Syria tributary to him (2 Sam. viii. 5 f.; 1 Chr. xviii. 4 ff.) In Solomon's time indeed Rezon had assumed to be king of Damascus (1 Ki. xi. 23 ff.); yet it is a question, whether he attained to complete inde-

[1] Movers also (Krit. Unters. p. 125) has quite misunderstood our passage, when he after Hitzig (d. proph. Jonas Or. 1831 p. 23 and Comm. on Is. p. 184) explains it thus, that Jeroboam conquered Hamath itself and transferred it with Damascus to Judah, for which, wonderful to tell, he quotes Am. v. 27, "I will carry you away beyond Damascus."

pendence, as it is only said of him in the passage quoted, that he was hostile to Solomon during his whole reign, abhorred Israel and made himself king over Aram, but it is not mentioned that this province was lost to Israel under Solomon. The meaning of our words accordingly is, how Jeroboam restored Damascus and that part of Hamath, which under Solomon was included in the kingdom of Judah, to Israel, which in its origin received this northern part of the kingdom, whereby he restored the original boundaries of the kingdom in the north (v. 25)[1]—V. 29. As Jeroboam came to the sovereignty in the fifteenth year of Amaziah and reigned forty-one years, his death fell in the twenty-sixth year of Uzziah. If, therefore, his son became king in the thirty-eighth year of Uzziah (xv. 8), he cannot have ascended the throne immediately after the death of his father. See on xv. 8.

[1] Though according to 2 Chr. viii. 4 Solomon established magazine cities in Hamath, yet we are not to infer with Winer (R.W. i. p. 537) from this, that he possessed the city Hamath itself; still less does it lie "expressly" in these words. Unfounded also is Winer's farther remark i. p. q., that from the word הֵשִׁיב in our passage an earlier possession of the Israelites does not necessarily follow. For although the meaning of *again* does not lie immediately in שׁוּב, yet הֵשִׁיב can have here as well as in v. 25 no other meaning than, to bring back, restore. The difficulties, lastly, which Winer raised against viewing לִיהוּדָה as a genitive, are quite unimportant. For although הֵשִׁיב in this signification is often construed with *dat. pers.* or *cum* לְ, yet the construction with בְּ is by no means repugnant to the spirit of the language, and must be assumed here for this reason, that every other view, even that proposed by Winer "to Judah in Israel (that is, to the theocratic people, but in Israel)," is unnatural, since neither can Judah stand at once for the theocratic people, nor can the language be in any sense applied to a Judah in Israel.

# CHAPTER XV.

## REIGN OF AZARIAH OR UZZIAH KING OF JUDAH, VV. 1—7, AND OF SEVERAL KINGS OF ISRAEL, VV. 8—38.

Vv. 1—7. Comp. 2 Chr. xxvi. "In the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam . . . Azariah became king . . ." This chronological date is inconsistent with xiv. 2, 16, 17, 23. If Amaziah ascended the throne in the fifteenth year of Joash of Israel, and in his twenty-nine years' reign outlived Joash about fifteen years (xiv. 2—17), if, moreover, Jeroboam succeeded his father Joash in the fifteenth year of Amaziah (xiv. 23), and therefore Amaziah died in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam, Uzziah or Azariah can only have become king in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam, as there is not the slightest ground for the assumption of an *interregnum* of twelve years, much rather according to xiv. 21 was Azariah made king immediately after the death of his father.[1] To save the correctness of the statement, "in the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam," many wished to reckon not from the actual commencement of Jeroboam's reign, but from the time when his father Joash declared him king (Ussher *annal. ad. a.m.* 3168, Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 410, Tiele, Chron. p. 70, and many others.) By this the chronology is not disturbed, provided we compute, as all the supporters of this opinion do, the years of Jeroboam's reign not from his co-regency but from his sole sovereignty; but this opinion has no positive ground whatever, and deviates from the analogy of the other synchronistic dates, which always refer to the proper reign of the kings. We shall, therefore, be compelled with L. Capell., Grot.,

[1] The ancients have rightly rejected the hypothesis of an interregnum applied here also by Mich., Walther (*harm. bibl.* p. 268), Petav. and others, because, not to speak of its contradicting the text, thereby the interregnum introduced after the death of Jeroboam in Israel must have been prolonged to twenty-two or twenty-three years. Comp. *des. Vign. chron.* i. p. 356 f., Budd. hist. eccl. ii. p. 409, Dahl, Amos new transl. p. 6, and Maur. in the *Commentatt. theol.* edited by Rosenm. and himself, ii. 1, p. 284 f.

*des Vign. Chron.* i. p. 355 f. and others to regard the number twenty-seven as an error of transcription originating in the change of טז into כז and alter it into fifteen.[1]—V. 3 ff. The author of our books limits himself to this, to characterize the spirit of the reign of Uzziah by the formula customary with him, without specifying merely one particular act of his long and, as appears from the parallel passage in 2 Chr. xxvi., eventful reign, probably because it exercised no essential or permanent influence on the development of the theocracy (comp. ch. xvi.) As Amaziah was unfaithful to the Lord in the last years of his reign (see on xiv. 3), so Uzziah did that which was right in the eyes of God only so long as Zechariah, who was experienced in the visions of God, lived, and during this time carried on successful wars against the Philistines and Arabians, fortified the walls of Jerusalem with strong towers, built watch towers in the wilderness, and digged cisterns for the protection and the supply of his large flocks, promoted the culture of the field and the vineyard, and collected a numerous and well appointed army (2 Chr. xxvi. 5—15.) But the great power to which he thereby attained made him arrogant, and estranged his heart from the law of the Lord, so that he, like the heathen kings, wished to assume to be sovereign pontiff of his kingdom, and intruding into the sacred functions belonging solely to the Levitical priests according to the law of Moses, to offer incense in the temple, for which he was punished on the spot with the leprosy (v. 5, and 2 Chr. xxvi. 16 ff.) With respect to these accounts peculiar to Chronicles, which Gramberg's injudicious criticism declared to be mere inventions, even Winer (R.W. ii. p. 754) remarks: "they harmonize very well with the rigorous and warlike character of the reign of this sovereign, Is. xiv. 29." They are also the less to be questioned,

[1] Another expedient, namely, to understand the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam with some Rabb. not of the beginning of his reign, but of the time that Jeroboam had still to reign, or even with other Rabb. and Tremellius of the year in which Uzziah was smitten with the leprosy (see Meyer *ad. Sed. Ol.* p. 950 ff.), is so unnatural, that it is scarcely worthy of mention. The unnatural character of the latter assumption, in which v. 1 is joined with v. 5 into one sentence, and v. 2—4 is taken parenthetically, has been already exposed by *des Vign. l.c.* p. 358 ff.

as they almost all receive confirmation from other sources,[1] and

[1] Comp. my apol. Vers. p. 418 ff. What Movers in his Krit. Unters. p. 125 f., has brought together for the vindication of the peculiar accounts of Chronicles stands very much in need of a critical sifting.— The subjugation of the Philistines is presupposed in Is. xiv. 28 (comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 495) and partly also by Amos vi. 2, comp. with xi. 6—8. To the great buildings of Uzziah Hosea viii. 14 alludes: "Judah hath multiplied fenced cities;" and Isaiah (ii. 7), in a prediction embracing the times of Uzziah and Jotham, depicts the land as "full of silver and gold, and no end of its treasures, full of horses, and no end of its chariots," whereby the efforts of Uzziah, mentioned in Chronicles, to increase the prosperity of his kingdom and augment his military force are abundantly confirmed. It is more difficult to support the statement (Chr. v. 10), that the Ammonites paid him tribute, though as little can its historical truth underlie any reasonable doubt. As the territory of the Ammonites was separated by Gilead from the kingdom of Judah, there arises a question not easy to be answered, in what way Uzziah may have made them tributary to him. Credner (i. p. q. p. 787 f.) thinks that Uzziah made this nation tributary during the distraction that occurred after the death of Jeroboam II. in the kingdom of Israel, by political negotiation without warlike interference, inasmuch as they, being afraid of his superior power, voluntarily submitted themselves to the protection of the kingdom of Judah, but because this was done from regard to the personal character of Uzziah, they had attempted to revolt again under Jotham, so that he was obliged to enforce the payment of tribute by war (2 Chr. xxvii. 5.) But this hypothesis is too destitute of probability to command our assent, especially if we reflect, that the Moabites, dwelling between Judah and the Ammonites, were not subdued, but as Credner thinks, had been able by all manner of excuses and evasions, first to delay and then actually to withhold submission. But were the Ammonites who lived farther from Judah so altogether deficient in excuses and evasions? Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 130 f.) accounts for the submission of the Ammonites in this way, that Uzziah and Jotham had possessed a part of the territory of Gilead "probably ceded by Jeroboam to Uzziah in consequence of an amicable arrangement," through which the way was open to them to make war on the Ammonites. But of such a friendly cession of a part of Gilead to Judah history knows nothing. It no more follows from the passages quoted by Movers, 2 Ki. xiv. 28; Mic. vii. 14, than from the numbering of the Gadites under Jotham mentioned 1 Chr. v. 17, or from the fact that Uzziah also possessed flocks, בַּמִּישׁוֹר (2 Chr. xxvi. 10.) For even though מִישׁוֹר often denotes the great plain in the territory of Reuben (for example Deut. iii. 10, iv. 43, etc.), yet this word is also used of other plains, inasmuch as Jer. xxi. 13, Jerusalem is designated as צוּר הַמִּישׁוֹר, and therefore Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 643) quite correctly understands it in 2 Chr. xxvi 10, *de planitie tribus Judae*. This hypothesis, therefore, is destitute of any tenable ground. Uzziah probably reduced the Ammonites to tribute

gain probability from the long duration of this reign. The time when Uzziah was smitten with leprosy is not mentioned, indeed, either here or in Chronicles, but this Divine punishment, which unfitted him for reigning, must have befallen him only in the last ten years of his fifty-two years' reign, because his son, who was only twenty-five years old at the death of his father (v. 33, and 2 Chr. xxvii. 1), immediately undertook the administration of the kingdom, and therefore must then have been at least fifteen years of age. The leprosy of the king is likewise described in our narrative as a Divine judgment, "Jehovah smote (וַיְנַגַּע) the king and he became a leper." This expression presupposes guilt, and therefore an act of the kind which is recorded in Chronicles, while the addition to the description of his conduct, "as his father Amaziah," warrants, indeed necessitates the assumption, that he did not do that which was right in the eyes of the Lord with undeviating consistency. So much the less reason is there to pronounce with de Wette and Win. i. p. q. the historical occasion mentioned in Chronicles for the infliction of this Divine judgment to be an invention of the writer, conceived in a Levitical spirit; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 316 f. On account of the

after the taking of Elath (xiv. 22), from which he might undertake an expedition against them without touching on the territory of the Moabites, and probably did undertake it because they had given aid to the Edomites against Judah, or from some other cause to us unknown. If their subjugation had taken place at the time of the anarchy succeeding the death of Jeroboam, it would also be conceivable that by an attack upon Gilead they had even threatened the kingdom of Judah, whereby Uzziah was induced to make war upon them in the most direct way through the territory of Reuben. The prophet Amos, who prophesied under Uzziah and Jeroboam, is acquainted with incursions of the Ammonites into Gilead, in which they perpetrated the greatest atrocities, for which he denounces upon them the Divine judgment, Am. i. 13 f. But this conjecture has small probability. The war between them and Jotham (2 Chr. xxvii. 5) also requires another approach to them for the Jews than through Gilead, as Jotham was not on so friendly terms with Pekah that he could have marched through his territory. Their revolt after Uzziah's death, in consequence of which Jotham commenced hostilities against them, is placed by Movers p. 133 in the fourth year of Jotham, and connected with the first invasion of Tiglath Pileser and the consequent deportation of the Gileadites; but on purely false presumptions and conclusions, as will be shown on xvi. 7 f. The time of the revolt is unknown, as it cannot be inferred from 2 Chr. xxvii. 5.

leprosy Uzziah was obliged to commit the government to his son, and submitting to the strictness of the Mosaic law (comp. on vii. 3) to live in a separate house. בֵּית הַחָפְשִׁית is explained by Win. (*lex s. v.*) and Ges. (*thes.* i. 509) after Iken (*diss. phil. theol.* ii. 184) and Mich. (*suppl.* p. 884), *nosocomium*, lazaretto. Altogether arbitrary and erroneous; for חָפַשׁ does not mean *debilis, infirmus fuit*, nor חָפְשִׁי *infirmus, aegrotus*; the Arab. خفش is not connected with it, because ش, as is well known, corresponds, not with שׁ, but with שׂ. חָפְשִׁי means only *liber* or *manumissus*, even in Ps. lxxxviii. 6, and בית החפשית Aquila has rightly explained by οἶκος ἐλευθερίας, house of liberation, so called, not *quia in ea segregati sunt ab hominibus et quasi liberi a societate eorum* (Kimchi), but as "the place where those dwelt, whom the Lord had manumitted, who no longer belonged to his servants;" comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 592.—עַל־הַבַּיִת *erat praefectus regiae*, was governor of the royal palace, judging the people of the land, that is, undertook the management of the palace and the royal office of judge, that is, the administration of the kingdom.—V. 7. The place where Uzziah was buried is called in 2 Chr. xxvi. 33, the field of burial of the kings. This is only a more exact definition of the general עִיר דָּוִד, but not a difference, as Winer (R. W. ii. p. 754) asserts, as the burial-field of the kings was in the city of David, and Uzziah was buried in the royal burial-field indeed, but not in the royal vault on account of his leprosy.

Vv. 8—12. *Reign of Zechariah of Israel.* "In the thirty-eighth year of Uzziah king of Judah Jeroboam's son, Zechariah, became king over Israel." As according to our remarks on xiv. 29 Jeroboam died on the twenty-sixth year of Uzziah, there is an *interregnum* of ten or twelve years between the death of Jeroboam and the beginning of the reign of his son Zechariah, as almost all chronologists admit, inasmuch as, without this assumption, the chronological synchronism would be completely destroyed; but the correctness of our author's statement is placed beyond a doubt by the commencements of the following reigns (vv. 13, 17, 23, 27), and all attempts to remove the difference otherwise prove themselves to be untenable at the first glance.

Comp. *Usseri Annal.* p. 45, Offerhaus, *spicil.* p. 117 f., *des Vignoles chron.* i. p. 262 f., *Budd. hist.* ii. p. 415, Win. R.W. i. p. 730 and ii. p. 822, Tiele, Chronol. p. 71, Maurer in the *commentatt. theol.* edited by himself and Rosenm. it. 1 p. 286 f.—V. 9 ff. Zechariah also continued in the sins of his fathers, in the worship of the calves, and the word of the Lord uttered (x. 30) concerning Jehu was therefore fulfilled in him. In consequence of a conspiracy he was put to death, and the throne taken from the house of Jehu. קָבָל־עָם before the people, that is, openly before the eyes of all. As Israel was not led by the tokens of the Lord's mercy experienced under Joash, and especially under Jeroboam, any more than by the previous heavy judgments and the earnest appeals and warnings of the prophets Hosea and Amos, to repent and return to the Lord his God and King, the judgment of rejection must at last break in upon a people so shamefully scorning the grace, long-suffering, and covenant faithfulness of God. We see the kingdom, therefore, after the death of Jeroboam, hastening with rapid strides to its fall. In the sixty-two years from the death of Jeroboam to the conquest of Samaria by Shalmaneser, two anarchies, making up twenty years, prevailed, and six kings followed one another, of whom only one, Menahem, died a natural death, so that his son succeeded him on the throne; the remaining five were dethroned and murdered by rebels, so that, according to the just remark of Witsius, with the murder of Zechariah not only the sentence of Hosea (i. 4), "I will visit the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu,"[1] but also the sentence forming a parallel with it, "and will cause to cease

[1] "The blood of Jezreel," or the blood shed in Jezreel, is the extirpation of the dynasty of Ahab and the Baal worshippers. So far as Jehu acted therein by command of God, this act was imputed to him as meritorious (comp. on x. 30), but so far as he followed his own ambition and sin more than the command of God, he was involved in guilt. The prophet Hosea estimates the act according to its subjective motives, and pronounces it a deed of blood, whereas in our historical narrative, above x. 30, only the objective act as such is regarded. It is quite perverse, therefore, in Hitzig, Comm. on Hos., to explain the words of the prophet in the way, that the prophet blames Jehu not for the death of Joram and Jezebel, but for the murder of Ahaziah and his brothers, as well as the bloodshed, 2 Ki. x. 11. As if the prophets had determined their predictions by such petty partialities! The right view of the passage Hitzig might have discovered in Witsius *l.c.*

the kingdom of the house of Israel," was carried into effect, inasmuch as with Zechariah the kingdom properly ceased in Israel. *Nam successores Zachariae non tam reges fuerunt, quam fures, latrones ac tyranni, augusto Regum nomine indigni, qui tyrannidem male partam neque melius habitam fœde amiserunt.* *Witsius* *Δεκαφυλ.* p. 320.

Vv. 13—16. Zechariah's murderer, Shallum, held the throne only one month (יֶרַח יָמִים comp. Deut. xxi. 13, and as to this use of יָמִים Ges. *thes.* ii. 585), as he was assailed in war by Menahem of Tirzah, and slain by him at Samaria. וַיַּעַל (v. 14) here denotes, as *term. milit. techn.* the advance of the foe or hostile army. Menahem must therefore have been general or commander of the forces, as Josephus (Antiq. ix. 11, 1) expressly says. As to the situation of Tirzah see on 1 Ki. xv. 21.—V. 16. Setting out from Tirzah Menahem smote תִּפְסַח also, the city *Thapsacus* with all its environs, because it did not open its gates to him, that is, he took it by storm, and treated the vanquished with such barbarous vengeance that he did not spare the child in the mother's womb; comp. viii. 12.—תִּפְסַח is no other than Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the border city of the kingdom of Israel under Solomon (1 Ki. v. 4; see above p. 57), which, with the restoration of the old limits of the kingdom by Jeroboam II. (xiv. 25, 28) had again come to the kingdom of Israel, as J. D. Mich. has justly remarked. On the contrary most expositors, and following them v. Raum. Pal. p. 164 regard our תפסח as a city of Palestine in the neighbourhood of Tirzah. But this assumption is destitute of all ground, and has only arisen from this, that explaining מִתִּרְצָה "from Tirzah onward," they understood our author, as if Menahem had wasted the whole country from Tirzah to Tiphsah. But even Maurer, the most decided advocate of this opinion concerning Tiphsah, rejects this view, and with Schultz and de Wette refers מתרצה to the verb in the beginning of the verse: "he smote setting out from Tirzah" (*excursione ex oppido Tirzae facta*), but thinks, *Menahem non is fuit qui in tam latum terrarum spatium, quale Tirzae, oppido Ephr. et Tapsaco interjectum est, tamque magnam et locupletem urbem, victricia arma proferret.* But why Menahem was not the man, it might be difficult to prove. What Maurer says on this,

namely that Menahem was *civitatis a capite revulsae omnique scelere inde ab initiis laceratae regulus*, would, if it had argumentative force at all, prove too much, namely that Jeroboam II. also was not in a position to reconquer the ancient boundaries of his kingdom in the north. But where have we the standard by which to estimate the valour and strength of the army of Israel led by Menahem, in order to be able to assert with confidence that he was not able to take the city Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the size and strength of which at that time are to us completely unknown? While, then, the reasons adduced for a Tiphsah in the neighbourhood of Tirzah are unfounded, the name תִּפְסַח *trajectus* is also opposed to this opinion, which is scarcely explicable, even if conceivable, of a town not far from Tirzah.

Vv. 17—22. Menahem's ten years' reign resembles that of his antitheocratic predecessors. During his reign the Assyrians for the first time marched against Israel under king Pul; but Menahem gave Pul 1000 talents of silver (about £342,200), "that his hands might be with him, to confirm the kingdom in his hand" (v. 19.) These words are so understood by Ephr. Syr., C. a Lap., Calm., Dereser, and others, with reference to Hos. v. 13, as if Menahem had summoned Pul to his aid, in order to establish his dominion by his assistance. But this view is not necessarily demanded by the words of Hosea, "Ephraim goes to the Assyrian," namely to seek aid, and is in contradiction with the words of our verse, "Pul came against the land." In conformity with these words we must understand the matter thus: Pul of his own motion, perhaps induced thereto by the expedition of Menahem against Thapsacus, advanced against the kingdom of Israel; then Menahem sent him 1000 talents, in order not only to divert him from his plans of conquest, but at the same time to purchase his friendship and aid for the establishment of his own precarious sovereignty, so that Menahem did not properly invite the Assyrians into the land, but only changed the enemy, when advancing against the country, by this tribute into a confederate for the security of his usurped dominion; which the prophet Hosea, who was less concerned about the historical fact than the disposition betrayed therein, might very well censure as a going of Ephraim to the Assyrians (besides v. 13 comp. also vii. 11, viii.

9) and a covenant-making with Asshur (xii. 2.) Pul (פּוּל) is the first Assyrian king, whom the Old Testament mentions after Nimrod, who extended his dominion over Asshur and built Nineveh (Gen. x. 9 ff.) With him the conquests of the Assyrians in hither Asia begin, and are continued by his successors Tiglath Pileser (v. 29, xvi. 9, and 1 Chr. v. 26), Shalmaneser (xvii. 5 ff., xviii. 9 ff.), and Sennacherib (xviii. 13 ff.), until the latter, under Hezekiah, suffered the total extermination of his army, and on his return to Nineveh was put to death by his sons, on which his son Esarhaddon succeeded him.[1] According to the biblical accounts, the Assyrian empire in the time of Pul was at the height of its power, with which also agree the fragments from the history of this empire, which are handed down to us in the Chronicon of Eusebius from Berosus, Alexander Polyhistor, and Abydenus. According to the citations of Polyhistor from Berosus, after Semiramis forty-five Assyrian kings reigned altogether 526 years. They were followed by Pûl, who invaded Judaea; after-

[1] In modern times Sargon also (Is. xx. 1) is usually named as an Assyrian king, who according to Paul., Rosenm., Gesen., Hitzig on Is. xx. and others, must have reigned only a short time between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, whereas Vitringa and Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 128 f.) hold Sargon to be the same as Shalmaneser, but Kalinsky, Marsham, and J. D. Mich., as Esarhaddon, and the Rabbins, Hieron., and Schroeer (*imper. Babyl. et Nini* p. 152) as Sennacherib. Of all these opinions the last only is probable. He cannot have reigned between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib, because there is no interval between the two, as Sennacherib appeared in Judea in the year 714 (xviii. 13), but Shalmaneser can scarcely have been dead before the year 716 or 715, as, according to a notice of Menander of Ephesus in Josephus (Ant. ix. 14, 2), after the conquest of Samaria in the year 722 he made war on the Phœnicians, and then besieged Tyre for five years. Josephus, indeed, does not expressly say that this war took place after the dissolution of the kingdom of the ten tribes, but this we must conclude from the fact that Hoshea king of Israel would scarcely have ventured to revolt from the Assyrians, as long as the Assyrian army was in Phœnicia. To this it is to be added, that according to Tob. i. 18 Shalmaneser was succeeded on the throne by his son Sennacherib. But the identifying of Sargon with Shalmaneser is met by the objection, that Shalmaneser scarcely extended his conquests to Philistæa. On the contrary, it speaks for his identity with Sennacherib at least, that Tartan, Sargon's general (Is. xxi. 1) appeared under Sennacherib before Jerusalem, xviii. 17.

wards, in the time of Hezekiah, Senecheribus (Sennacherib) reigned eighteen years, Asordanes eight, Sammughes twenty-one, whose brother Sardanapalus twenty-one, Nabopolassar twenty, and Nabucodrossor (Nebuchadnezzar) forty-three (*Chron. Armen.* b. i. ch. 4 and 5, p. 18 ff. *edit. Mediol.*) Abydenus (*ibid.* p. 25) names the following Assyrian sovereigns, Sennacherib, Nergilus (or Adrameles), Axerdis, Sardanapalus, Saracus, under whom his general Busalosor (Nabopolassar) assumed the sovereignty of Babylonia, attacked Ninus, and, after Saracus had burned himself with his palace, held the dominion over the Chaldaeans and Babylonians. Comp. Wilh. Hupfeld, *exercitt. Herodot. spec.* i. p. 9—11. By these fragments our biblical accounts of the Assyrian empire are sufficiently confirmed, inasmuch as, notwithstanding their deviations in several names, so much appears certain, that it was at that time still undiminished in power, and only ceased to exist a long time after Esarhaddon, with the conquest of Nineveh by Nabopolassar.[1]

[1] By this means are harmonized the scattered notices, which Herodotus furnishes concerning the expedition of Sennacherib against Egypt (ii. 141), and the taking of Nineveh by Cyaxares the Mede (i. 106) after the 520 years' duration of the Assyrian dominion over Upper Asia (i. 95.) For even if Herodotus does not expressly mention the participation of the Babylonians in the conquest of Nineveh, yet it may be inferred from several of his intimations (comp. Hupf. i. p. q. p. 7 and 21), while again the notices of Polyhistor and Abyd. concerning the marriage of the daughter of the Median prince Asdahages with Nabucodrossor (*Euseb. chron. Arm.* p. 21 and 25) point to a connexion of the Babylonians with the Medes in the destruction of the Assyrian monarchy, so that Josephus (Ant. x. 5, 1) is fully justified in saying, that the Medes and Babylonians destroyed the Assyrian empire. But the fall of this empire, with the conquest of Nineveh (Herod. i. 106), cannot have occurred so late as 606 B.C., about a year and a half before the death of Nabopolassar, as Hupf. (i. p. q. p. 7 f.), led astray by the misunderstood passage, 2 Ki. xxiii. 29, assumes, in contradiction to Joseph. (Ant. x. 5, 1), but must have taken place before the war carried on by Cyaxares with the Lydians 610 B.C. (Herod. i. 74), and indeed in the beginning of the twenty years' reign of Nabopolassar, that is, in 625 or 624, comp. Kalkar in Pelt's theolog. Mitarb. part 2, p. 76 f.—On the contrary, according to the citations from Ctesias in Diod. Sic. (ii. 23—28), Nineveh, after a three years' siege by Arbaces the Mede, and Belesys the Babylonian, was destroyed under Sardanapalus, and the dominion of the Assyrians, after a duration of 1300 years, transferred to the

V. 20. וַיֹּצֵא *exegit tributum*, construed with עַל *tributum imposuit*, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 616. גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל are not warriors or military heroes; for least of all from the warriors could Menahem

Medes, while Belesys retained the satrapy of Babylonia, and began to reign in his own name as over his own kingdom. This event is usually placed about 880 B.C. (see Hupf. *l. c.* p. 5), while others place it about 260 years before Cyrus, and make Sardanapalus, according to a notice of Euseb., contemporary with Jeroboam II., who died 783 B.C., see Winer R.W. i. p. 119 f. But if the dominion of the Assyrians ceased in the interval between 880 and 800, and in its place a Median monarchy with an independent Babylonian kingdom succeeded, the Assyrians cannot possibly have appeared under Menahem 771—760, and later still in hither Asia as a conquering power. If we chose even to modify with H. Leo (Lehrb. d. Universalgesch. i. p. 118) the hypothesis of a new Assyrian monarchy after the fall of the old under Sardanapalus, which has been devised to reconcile Ctesias with the accounts of the Bible, in such a manner, that the destruction of the old would be nothing more than the founding of a properly independent Median monarchy in the Medo-Persian high lands and in the low land of the Jihun (or Bactria), while the Assyrian monarchy continued under its own kings perhaps of the race of Belesys: it would still, apart from the consideration that it completely alters the accounts of Ctesias in Diodor. Sic., be inconsistent with the biblical accounts, inasmuch as, according to these, if not Pul, at all events Tiglath Pileser and Shalmaneser must have possessed Media, because they transplanted the captive Israelites to Assyria and Media (1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Ki. xv. 29, xvii. 6, xviii. 11.) If we reflect besides, that the assumption of a second Assyrian monarchy is destitute of all historical evidence, that none of the old writers makes the least mention of a twofold destruction of Nineveh or of a restoration of this city after its destruction under Sardanapalus, but, according to the Bible accounts, Nineveh was still unimpaired in the time of the prophet Jonah under Jeroboam II., about 800 B.C., and even much later in the times of the prophet Zephaniah living under Josiah (reigning 642—611), though, according to Zeph. ii. 13, it was soon to be destroyed, that, finally, the statements of two Sardanapali, in the Scholiast to Aristophanes Nub. v. 1022, as little deserve the name of historical testimony as the notice of Syncellus p. 205 of a second Ninus as successor of Sardanapalus (comp. Hupf. *l.c.* p. 29 and 38): we must reject this hypothesis as not merely unsatisfactory, but destitute of all historical ground, and may, if we do not wish to accuse Ctesias of intentional falsification of history, merely assent to the view of Hupfeld (*l.c.* p. 34 ff.), that Ctesias took the sovereigns found registered in the Median annals from Arbaces to Astyages for independent kings of Media, and, thereby led astray, not only placed Sardanapalus with the fall of the Assyrian empire that took place under him about 250 or 260 years too early, but also transferred to Arbaces that which was accomplished only by Dejoces and

levy such a tax,[1] but, men of wealth, *pollentes opibus* (Syr., Vulg., Luth., Vatabl., Grot., Cler., and others, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 262), or more correctly still, men of respectability and influence, inasmuch as this meaning alone, not the special notion of wealth, can be educed from Ruth ii. 1, and 1 Sam. ix. 2.—The "fifty shekels from each" depends on וַיֹּצֵא, not on לָתֵת. By this tribute Pul was induced to return to his own land, but, according to 1 Chr. v. 26, carried away with him the inhabitants of Gilead.

Vv. 23—26. *Pekahiah* succeeded his father in the government "in the fiftieth year of Azariah king of Judah." As Menahem became king in the thirty-ninth of king Azariah, and reigned ten years, he must have died in the forty-ninth year of Azariah. If, therefore, his son ascended the throne only in the fiftieth year of Azariah, some months elapsed between the death of Menahem and Pekahiah's accession, because, probably in the unsettled state of the kingdom, his right to the throne was contested. He held it also only two years, as his adjutant (שָׁלִישׁ see above p. 145) Pekah conspired against him, and, with fifty Gileadites, put him to death. V. 25. "Smote him in the castle (אַרְמוֹן 1 Ki. xvi. 18, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 152) of the king's house with Argob and Arieh." אֶת־אַרְגֹּב וְאֶת־הָאַרְיֵה most interpreters understand so, that Argob and Arieh were Pekah's accomplices,

Astyages, the former of whom delivered Media from the Assyrian supremacy, the latter, with Labynetus or Nabopolassar, took Nineveh, and put an end to the Assyrian empire (Herod. i. 95 f. and 106.)—So much for our purpose concerning this question; its farther investigations see in Hupfeld, whose line of proof is not quite free from error, but at all events deserves the commendation, which has been briefly given to it by H. Leo in the Berl. Yahrbb. f. Wissensch. Krit. 1844, April, 72, p. 575 f.

[1] Even those who understand גִּבּוֹרֵי חַיִל of warriors have acknowledged the weight of this argument, and hence S. Schm. will thus conceive the sense, *quod Menahem istam pecuniam impossuerit universo Israeli, nec viris quidem fortibus exceptis;* but this is an arbitrary addition to the text. But J. D. Mich. endeavoured to remove the difficulty by the hypothesis, that at that time the military form of government arising from the civil wars, existed among the ten tribes, and the soldiers exacted the tax imposed upon them from others again who were subordinate to them. Quite improbable and irreconcilable with the text.

who were conjoined with him in slaying the king; but the words immediately following, "and with him fifty of the sons of the Gileadites," appear more to favour the view of S. Schm., *quod Argob et Arjeh fuerint duo principes Pekachjae, quorum potentiam et auctoritatem timuerit Pekach ideoque cum rege eos trucidaverit.*

Vv. 27—31. *Reign of Pekah* (פֶּקַח) *the son of Remaliah.* Under him the Assyrian king Tiglath Pileser (תִּגְלַת פִּלְאֶסֶר or תִּגְלַת פְּלֶאסֶר xvi. 7, פִּלְנְאֶסֶר or תִּגְלַת פִּלְנֶסֶר 1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Chr. xxviii. 20)[1] came, conquered a part of the country and carried its inhabitants into captivity to Assyria. This took place in the last year of Pekah, in the beginning of the reign of Ahaz king of Judah, comp. v. 37.—V. 29. Concerning the towns Ijon and Abel-beth-maachab (Abil), see on 1 Ki. xv. 20. Janoah (יָנוֹחַ) is to be sought between Abil and Kedesh, or at least in their neighbourhood.[2] Kedesh (קֶדֶשׁ) a city of refuge belonging to the Levites on the mountains of Naphtali (Jos. xix. 37, xx. 7, xxi. 32), on the west side of the Sea of Merom, twenty Roman miles from Tyre, the birth-place of Barak (Judg. iv. 6, comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 129 f.), still exists as a village under the old name on the hills west of Huleh, comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 622. In this region lay Hazor, see above p. 141. "And Gilead and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali." As the last words

[1] V. Bohlen (*Symbolae* p. 24) explained the name of this king, who is nowhere else mentioned, quite unnaturally تيغلد پيلـ آذر Tig-lad-pil-adzer, *gladius intrepidus (est) elephas ignis i.e. Dei*; much more probably Gesen. in his *lex. man s. v.*, *Dominus Tigris*, according to which תִּגְלַת will stand for Diglath, the river Tigris.

[2] Decidely false is the assumption of Winer (R. W. i. 630) and Gesen. (*thes.* ii. 863), that יָנוֹחָה is the border city of Ephraim and Manasseh mentioned Jos. xvi. 6 f., which according to Euseb. lay twelve Roman miles east of Neapolis (Sichem.) For Galilean cities are here spoken of. The Reviewer of v. Raumer's Pal. in the Münchner gel. Anz. 1836, Nov. No. 242, p. 902, is disposed to find Janoah in the large village Januach inhabited by Druses, which was found by St. Schulz in the mountain tracts north east of Acre, and is used by the principal inhabitants of Acre as a summer residence, see Paulus' Samml. von Reis. vii. p. 98. But this also lies too far remote to have been reckoned to the territory of Naphtali.

are annexed without וְ, it might appear, that they were a comprehensive description of all the fore-mentioned places and districts, especially as Galilee includes the northern district of the tribe of Naphtali (see above p. 131.) Accordingly Gesen. comm. on Is. i. p. 352) thinks, that Gilead here as often denotes a very small district, even a city (Hos. vi. 5), and that the writer, notwithstanding the small exception (namely, that Gilead lay on the other side of Jordan), may have included all the before-named places, under the general name, the whole land of Naphtali. But that Gilead does not denote a city in Hos. vi. 5, has been rightly observed by Winer (R. W. i. p. 504.) As little can it be proved that this name is used of a very small district of Perea, lying to the east of Merom. We can therefore understand Gilead only of the whole territory of the Israelites east of the Jordan, 1 Chr. v. 6 and 26, demands this, and must therefore take כָּל־אֶרֶץ נפ״ in apposition with הַגָּלִילָה which it more strictly defines. But the enumeration is not therefore altogether without order, as Cler. appealing to the simplicity of the Hebrew style which *minus accuratum ordinem nequaquam respuit*, imagines, but purely historical, that is, following the actual order of the conquests. Tiglath Pileser first took the several partly fortified cities adjacent to the sea of Merom, then turned to Gilead, conquered this district, and on his return thence, the remaining part of Galilee, namely, the whole land of Naphtali.[1] Comp. still on xvii. 6.—V. 30. Pekah met with his death by a conspiracy formed by Hoshea the son of Elah, who assumed the sovereignty "in the twentieth year of Jotham." This statement is very surprising, as Jotham reigned only sixteen years, and Ahaz had become king in the seventeenth year of Pekah (xvi. 1), according to which Pekah's death must have fallen properly in the fourth year of Ahaz. The reason of this extraordinary statement can

[1] In the annals of the kings the conquests of T. P. were probably mentioned each more at large, but it would have been too much for our author in epitomizing to specify them all: he therefore contents himself, after mentioning several cities, with including all the other places under the general terms Gilead and Galilee. Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 133) erroneously asserts, that our author only mentions Gilead, by the way, because the most part of it still belonged to the kingdom of Judah under Jotham.

only be sought with Ussher (*chronol. sacr.* p. 80) in this, that hitherto no mention had been made of Ahaz, Jotham's successor, because the reign of Jotham is first recorded in v. 32 ff.[1]

Vv. 32—38. *Reign of Jotham of Judah.* Comp. 2 Chr. xxvii. 1—9. The statement, "in the second year of Pekah . . . . Jotham became king," is explained by this, that the first year of Pekah, which coincides with the fifty-second of Uzziah, was not complete, inasmuch as he did not attain to the sovereignty in Nisan. For the beginning of Jotham's reign is not separated a

[1] All other conjectures, as for example that of Lightfoot (Op. i. p. 244), prove themselves at the first glance to be untenable; comp. Win. R. W. i. p. 724. Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 72 f.) has endeavoured to show in a peculiar manner, that instead of, "in the twentieth year of Jotham," is to be read, in the twentieth year of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, inasmuch as he makes Jotham reign eight years in conjunction with his father Uzziah, and after his death only eight years alone, and then lengthens the reign of Ahaz eight years, fixes it at twenty-four instead of sixteen years, and in order to save the synchronism of the history of Israel, assigns to Pekah also twenty-eight instead of twenty years, whereby the eight years' interregnum usually assumed between Pekah and Hoshea falls away, while the collective period of the kings is not altered, because the interval between the death of Uzziah and the beginning of Hezekiah's reign is still thirty-two years, and these thirty-two years are made up, only not with the Books of Kings and Chronicles by the sixteen + sixteen years of the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, but by the eight years of Jotham and twenty-four years of Ahaz. But the whole combination stands upon the weakest possible footing. Besides our statement, "in the twentieth year of Jotham," the force of which is fully neutralized not only by the other dates, but also by the circumstance that Hitzig must insert the words, "Ahaz the son of" to make it subserve his purpose, there is merely the age of Hezekiah at his accession to the throne, which demands a more than sixteen years' reign of Ahaz, because he must otherwise, according to xviii. 2, comp. with xvi. 2, have begotten Hezekiah in the eleventh year of his life, which is "purely impossible," for the farther assertion, that the statement v. 37, that Jotham was assailed in war by the Syrians and Ephraimites, is quite improbable, no one will hold to be demonstrated or demonstrable. And the statement concerning Hezekiah's age at the commencement of his reign will be shown to be devoid of evidence on xviii. 2. The whole hypothesis is shown to be untenable partly by the arbitrary manner in which a multitude of texts, namely, v. 33, xvi. 1 and 2, xvii. 1, 2 Chr. xxvii. 1, 8, xxviii. 1, must be altered at will, partly by this, that the time, during which Jotham conducted the government in his father's lifetime, is in vv. 5, 7, 2 Chr. xxvi. 21, 23, expressly and clearly distinguished from his sixteen years' reign after the death of Uzziah.

full year from that of Pekah, and therefore the sixteen years' reign of Jotham, which actually amounted only to fifteen years and some months, had terminated according to xvi. 1, in the seventeenth year of Pekah. Of Jotham's reign, besides the general description of it in the usual terms, nothing further is recorded, but that he built the higher gate of the temple; comp. on this the remarks on xi. 19. According to 2 Chr. xxviii. 3, he built besides an addition to the wall of Ophel, several cities in the mountains of Judah, and castles and towers in the forests, and reduced the rebellious Ammonites, so that they paid him tribute three years. Jotham accordingly prosecuted with vigour, what his father had begun and undertaken for the promotion of the outward prosperity of his kingdom. Comp. here the note on v. 3 ff.—V. 37. "In these days (that is towards the end of Jotham's reign), the Lord began to send against Judah, Rezin," etc. הִשְׁלִיחַ בְּ *immisit calamitatem*, comp. Lev. xxvi. 22, Am. viii. 11. These words express more than the mere alliance of the kings of Israel and Syria, and their preparation for war, or the mere hostile disposition of these kings to Judah, as Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 269 thinks; they denote the actual beginning of the hostile invasion, which was continued after Jotham's death, so that the enemy appeared before Jerusalem in the first year of Ahaz, comp. on xvi. 5.

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

### REIGN OF AHAZ, KING OF JUDAH. COMP. 2 CHR. XXVIII.

Vv. 1—4. On the commencement of the reign of Ahaz, "in the seventeenth year of Pekah," see on xv. 32.—V. 2. Under the prosperous reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, with the increase of wealth and worldly power, luxury and voluptuousness, false self-confidence and forgetfulness of God, had become very prevalent among the people, as the first chapters of Isaiah abundantly testify. It cannot therefore surprise us, that the theocratic principle still externally maintained by those two kings

was abandoned by Ahaz, that under his reign sincere dependence on Jehovah having vanished from the hearts of the people, disappeared also from their outward conduct, that Ahaz "did not that which was right in the eyes of the Lord his God, like David his father" (v. 2), as his predecessors, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham, had not acted altogether as David (xii. 3, xiv. 3, xv. 3 and 39), that he "walked in the way of the kings of Israel" (v. 3), that he dedicated his son to Molech by fire, that he "sacrificed and burned incense in the high places, and on the hills and under every green tree" (v. 4), that is, that by him the worship of images, high places and false gods of every kind was introduced into the whole land. Yet we are not so to understand the idolatry of Ahaz, as if the worship of Jehovah was immediately discontinued. This corresponds with the character of polytheism, which only in special cases becomes the fanatical persecutor of other gods and religions, but in general seeks to venerate several gods beside each other, in direct opposition to the worship of Jehovah, which is degraded into idolatry by any equalization of Jehovah with another God (see above, p. 162.) Only in the last years of his reign does Ahaz proceed so far in his idolatry as to suspend the external temple worship of Jehovah, and shut up the doors of the temple (2 Chr. xxviii. 24.)—The description of the religious conduct of this king in our verses gives only a summary account of his idolatry, from which we are not to conclude that Ahaz introduced the different kinds of idolatry all at one time. Much rather did he proceed from step to step, and the offering of his son to Molech obviously occurred only at the time when he was hard pressed by the Assyrians, from whom he expected aid.—The words, "he walked in the way of the kings of Israel," to which is added, 2 Chr. xxviii. 2, by way of explanation, "and made also molten images for Baalim," denote in the first place only the self-devised worship of Jehovah by images; for this was the way in which all the kings of Israel walked from first to last; though the phrase is so used of Joram, king of Judah, in viii. 18, that it denotes at the same time the Baal worship of the dynasty of Ahab. In this sense, that is, denoting the worship of images and of Baal at the same time, is it here also to be taken.—V. 3. Even his son he caused to go through the fire, that is, he offered him to Molech in the valley of Ben-

hinnom (xxiii. 10.) Instead of בנו stands in 2 Chr. xxviii. 3 the plural בָּנָיו, and in v. 16, מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר for the singular מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, although the reference is only to the one Assyrian king, Tiglath Pileser, in order to express generally the thought, which rests not in the number but the thing, in which case many languages occasionally employ the plural; comp. Gesen. Lehrgeb. p. 664, Ew. Krit. Gr. p. 584 f., and Winer Gramm. des neutestl. Spr. p. 200 f. of the 5th ed. As to the matter of fact we have here the first historically attested human sacrifice among the Israelites. In the Pentateuch, indeed, there are several warnings against the Canaanatish abominations of the sacrifice of children to Molech (Lev. xviii. 21; Deut. xviii. 10), and the punishment of stoning is prescribed for this transgression, but in case of neglect the extirpation of the transgressor is threatened by the Lord (Lev. xx. 2—5); but there is no proof that this abominable idolatry was actually practised in Israel before the times of Ahaz; for, as Movers Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 65 quite correctly remarks, "otherwise the abomination would certainly not have been passed over in silence by the biblical writers, who so often make mention of other forms of idolatry."[1] The phrase

[1] Movers is also certainly right, when he (p. 64 f., 324, etc.) derives the introduction of the worship of Molech from the first entrance of the Assyrians into Judea, and from this time forward assumes an intermixture of the Canaanitish idolatry with the Upper Asiatic or Assyrian fire-worship, even though the proofs adduced are much in need of a critical examination. According to the Old Testament, indeed, the worship of Molech is found among the Canaanites even in the times of Moses, for it is enumerated in the Pentateuch as in our passage among the abominations of the nations, which the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel (comp. Lev. xviii. 21, with v. 24 ff.; Deut. xviii. 9, 10, 12); but it is not therefore necessary that it should be of Canaanitish origin. For had it arisen among them, or been even their principal form of worship, how could we account for it, that it is not named from the time of Joshua to the Assyrian period among the various Canaanitish superstitions into which the Israelites almost at all times more or less fell? Its manifestation in Ahab's time can scarcely be otherwise viewed than in intimate connexion with the appearance of the Syrians in Palestine, whereby Movers, p. 65, is justified in the statement, "But when the Assyrian fire-gods, Adrammelech and Anammelech, became known, Ahaz first resumed the Canaanitish custom as the biblical writer remarks (comp. 2 Ki. xvi. 3), and from that time first is mentioned the valley of Hinnom with its sacrifices of children, which were there offered to Baal as Molech (comp. 2 Ki. xxxiii.

הֶעֱבִיר אֶת־בְּנוֹ בָאֵשׁ here, xvii. 17, xxi. 6; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 6; Ezek. xx. 31, is virtually equivalent to הֶעֱבִיר בְּנוֹ לַמֹּלֶךְ (Lev.

10; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 6; Jer. vii. 31, xix. 5; Ezek. xvi. 20, xxiii. 37.") After this let any one judge with what right P. v. Bohlen (d. alte Indien i. p. 304) could assert: "the horrible sacrifices of children were practised by the Hebrews from the brightest days of Solomon till after the exile," without even furnishing a single historical attestation of the statement. The same opinion is found in Winer (R.W. ii. p. 118) and others, who infer it from the identification of Molech with Milcom, which has been already refuted, p. 168 f. Finally Vatke (Rel. d. A. T. p. 190 ff. 245 and 685) asserts, that "the Israelites during the whole journey through the wilderness of Arabia, and even at a later period, worshipped Saturn as their national deity with animal and human sacrifices." But the proof of this assertion drawn from Amos v. 25 f. and Ezek. xx. 26, comp. xvi. 30 (perhaps 20), apart from the consideration of the perverse presupposition of Hegel, that the Jehovah religion developed itself only gradually till the 8th century B.C. step by step from rude nature worship, rests on an erroneous interpretation of the passages quoted. The words of Amos, "Have ye (says the Lord) offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? And ye bore the tabernacle of your king and the stand (כִּיּוּן) of your images, the star of your God, which ye made for yourselves," have no other meaning than this, that the great mass of the people of Israel, during the long period of their journey through the wilderness, neglected the worship of Jehovah by offerings, and instead of this adored a borrowed king of heaven with an idolatrous worship. But that this king of heaven, whose tabernacle and star they bore with them, was Saturn, is based upon the erroneous explanation of the word כִּיּוּן by Saturn, which is regarded as untenable even by Hitzig and Ewald. Comp. the excellent refutation of this opinion in Hengstenb. Beitr. ii. p. 108—118. Ezekiel knows still less of the worship of Saturn by the sacrifice of children in the wilderness. When it is said, Ezek. xx. 24 ff., "Because they (the Israelites) did not adhere to my (God's) judgments in the wilderness. . . . . I polluted them in their own gifts in the presenting of all the first born, that I might make them desolate," here also in opposition to the reference of the words בהעביר כל פטר רחם to the sacrificing of children to Molech, which is still maintained even by Ewald and Umbreit, Hävern. (Comm. on Ezek. p. 315) has with perfect justice remarked: "It is altogether incorrect in the ancient writers, as Vitringa, *observ. ss.* p. 267 f., to think here immediately of a worship of Molech, as Movers recently concludes from this passage, that 'the Israelites in Egypt (sic!), as the prophet Ezekiel expressly asserts, dedicated all the first-born to Molech,' die Phöniz. i. p. 328; comp. Vatke, p. 191. The prophet in this case could not possibly have omitted the essential באשׁ or למלך. Ezekiel then clearly

xviii. 21; Deut. xviii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 35) and תֵּת מִזַּרְעוֹ לַמֹּלֶךְ (Lev. xx. 2—4), as appears from העביר את בנו באש למלך, 2 Ki. xxiii. 10, and denotes the sacrifice of children to Molech. The older theologians are at variance on the question whether this phrase mean an actual burning of the children offered to Molech or only a passing of them between two funeral piles, a mere *februatio* or lustration by fire, inasmuch as Spencer *de leg. Hebr. rit. l.* 2 *c.* 360 *sqq.*, Witsius *miscell. ss. l.* 2 *diss.* 5 (*tom.* i. p. 608 ff.), Pfeiffer, *dub. vex. cent.* iv. *loc.* 80, p. 832 and others assumed both usages as co-existing. Jarchi *ad Lev.* xviii. 21, Moses Maim. and others have declared for the mere *februatio*, Cler. *ad Lev.* xviii. 21, Budd. *hist eccl.* i. p. 608 ff. and Mich. Mos. R.V., § 247 on the contrary for the burning. This last view is rightly regarded by the recent writers as alone correct, and is defended at length against the others by Gesen. in the *thes.* ii. 985. Compare also Movers p. 328. According to Ezek. xvi. 20 f., "Thou hast taken thy sons and daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and hast sacrificed these to them to be de-

alludes to Ex. xiii. 12, 13, but intentionally omits the there appearing לַיהוָה. He expresses himself indefinitely, and we are not to refer to v. 31, where he speaks of subsequent events, in order to define the meaning of the expression. The prophet admits, that they observed the law in regard to gifts, and the offering of the first-born, but in a perverted sense, inasmuch as they gave them a heathenish turn, and addicted themselves to nature worship, while they were externally attached to the worship of Jehovah." Moreover Movers has not cleared up either the question concerning the origin of the old Canaanitish Molech-worship, or that concerning the proper nature of Molech, by which is mostly understood the planet Saturn worshipped as a star of ill omen; for his assertion, that the ancestors of the Israelites, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites, who, according to the Old Testament, are confessedly only Abraham and Lot, had brought it from Upper Asia, from Chaldea, and Assyria, to Canaan (p. 63, 323, 333, 339, etc.), and that Molech had been blended with the old Canaanitish Baal or Bel into a Bel-Saturn, is at once refuted as erroneous by the fact, that Abraham and Lot were no worshippers of Molech, and did not enter into such close intercourse with the Canaanites, that these should have adopted the worship of Molech from them. Besides Molech is reckoned among the gods of the Canaanitish nations, who were to have been extirpated, and are uniformly distinguished from the Ammonites, Moabites, and Edomites. Thus the investigation concerning Molech is still in need of a critical review, which, however, cannot receive so brief and passing a notice, that we could compress it into a note.

voured. Was it too little in thy whoredom, that thou hast also slain my children, and delivered them בְּהַעֲבִיר אֹתָם לָהֶם," the offering consisted in the slaying and burning of children. Comp. also Ezek. xxii. 37; Jer. vii. 31, and xix. 5. Thus a burning alive cannot be intended, which even Hävern. p. 238 still finds possible in a manner not easy to comprehend, after he has immediately before mentioned the slaying as the first part (act) of the offering.[1] Both acts are usually denoted together by העביר באשׁ or העביר לַמֹּלֶךְ, for which in xvii. 31, and in Jer. vii. 31, is used שׂרף באשׁ, in 2 Chr. xxviii. 3 העביר באשׁ, and in Jer. xix. 5 שׂרף לבעל, clearly proving that העביר was an actual burning. Now as in point of expression a burning in the fire can scarcely be called a passing through the fire, we must agree with Movers, that " the burning of the children was regarded as a passing through, by which they attained to purification with the Deity after the dissolution of the earthly impure dross of the body," (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 329), while at the same time we must reject as fundamentally false the accompanying assertions, that the Israelites in Egypt had originally consecrated all the

[1] Certain and indubitable testimonies are wanting for the opinion that the children were burned alive. Eusebius in the principal passage of his *praep. ev. l.* iv. *c.* 16, where he enumerates the many human sacrifices of the ancients, mentions not a syllable of this horrid custom, but says, on the contrary, that at Salamis these victims were stabbed by the priests with spears in the belly (κατὰ τοῦ στομάχου) and then burned upon the kindled funeral piles (i. p. 164 ed. Hein), and besides speaks repeatedly by their σφαγή and ἀποσφάττειν (p. 165 ff.) Diod. Sic. also in *l.* xx. *c.* 12, where he describes the brazen statue of Kronos with its Molech arms outstretched and glowing with heat, says nothing of casting live children into them; and even passages quoted by Münter (Rel. d. Karth. p. 22) from Klitarch. and Photius by no means clearly exhibit this sense; but may as well be understood of the burning of children already dead; only the notice there quoted from Tzetzes of the brazen bulls used at Carthage in the sacrifice of children with pipes in their nostrils, so that the crying of the children sounded like the notes of pipes, would involve the burning of children alive, if Münter himself had not explained the latter as a later addition. In like manner this is presupposed in the description given by Jarchi *ad Jer.* vii. 31 of the statue of Molech. See the passage in Winer (R.W. ii. p. 119) and the representation of it according to this description in *Lundii* jud. Heiligth. p. 564. But Tzetzes and the Rabbins of the middle ages are very suspicious witnesses for a custom, which the older writers do not know.

first born to Molech (p. 328), and regarded Jehovah himself as Molech or the sacrificial fire devouring the children (p. 327), since they are not proved either by Ezek. xx. 26, or by Ex. xiii. 12, and Lev. xx. 3. For from the words, "I will cut him (who devotes his children to Molech) off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech to defile my sanctuary," (Lev. xx. 3), it no more follows, that the offering to Molech was made on the altar of the sanctuary of Jehovah, than as has been already remarked, that the worship of Molech is intended in Ezek. xx. 26. Movers' error has arisen from this, that he identifies the phrase הֶעֱבִיר לַמֹּלֶךְ corresponding to הֶעֱבִיר לַיהוָֹה with הֶעֱבִיר בָּאֵשׁ, whereas it is, perhaps practically, but not philologically equivalent to this expression. העביר ליהוה used of the first born (Ex. xiii. 12; Ezek. xx. 26) means, to cause to go over to the Lord (comp. for this signification of העביר Num. xxvii. 7, 8), give over, dedicate, offer to the Lord; on the contrary העביר באשׁ means, to cause to go through the fire. Now, if העביר למלך were used as practically equivalent to העביר באשׁ, this could only happen because the devoting of the children to Molech was effected by slaying and burning them in the fire, whereas the dedication of the first born to Jehovah consisted in this, that they were presented to the Lord in his sanctuary and redeemed (כל בכור בבניך תפדה Ex. xiii. 13.) Movers quite falsely asserts, p. 328, "It is philologically false, that הבעיר can signify in general, to dedicate, offer;" for the presenting of the first-born denoted in Ex. xiii. 12 by העביר is in v. 15 expressly called זבח ליהוה and thus העביר is quite identified with זבח.—On v. 3 comp. 1 Ki. xiv. 23. וַיְזַבֵּחַ has *tsere* without the pause contrary to the general rule, see Ew. Gr. § 274 and 297.

V. 5. "Then came Rezin . . . and Pekah up to war against Jerusalem, and pressed hard upon Ahaz, but could not make war," that is, they intended to besiege Jerusalem and conquer it, but it did not come to a siege much less to a conquest, comp. Is. vii. 1. Deviating from this, 2 Chr. xxviii. 5—15 relates, that these two kings smote Ahaz, and carried home many captives with abundant spoil; but the Israelites at the expostulation of the prophet Oded released their captives again,

and sent them back fed and clothed to the city of palm trees to their brethren. This account Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 269), Winer (R.W. i. p. 44), Maur., and others, pronounced to be irreconcilable with the relation of our verse and of Isaiah, and then rejected as an unhistorical exaggeration of the writer, whereas long before them the older interpreters recognized the two relations as supplementing each other, and reconciled them with one another, see my apol. Vers. p. 420 ff. But Chronicles tells not of a campaign which occurred after the expedition mentioned in our verse, as Grot. on 2 Chr. xviii. 5, and Ussher, *Annal. ad. a. m.* 3262 f., suppose, but of the events which preceded it, as most expositors rightly understand. The war which, according to xv. 37, began in the end of the reign of Jotham, was opened with the irruption of both kings into Judah, in which the Syrians and Israelites smote the Jewish army and took many prisoners. On this the two kings marched together to Jerusalem, but could effect nothing against this city, because Ahaz meanwhile had invited the Assyrian king Tiglath Pileser to his aid, and the latter had already invaded Syria, so that Rezin and Pekah, without having effected their object, retired from Jerusalem into their own country to defend it against the mighty Assyrian foe. But whether these two leading events, on the one hand the battle fought by the Syrians and Israelites with the Jews, recorded in Chronicles, on the other hand the subsequent united march of the two kings to Jerusalem, were only two main movements of the one great and prolonged campaign, as Lightf. *Op.* i. p. 101, Plüschke in Keil's and Tzschirner's Anal. i. 2, p. 46, Hengstenb. Christol. i. 2, p. 48, Kleinert, Echth. d. Jes. p. 45, and others, have supposed, or two different campaigns, the latter of which was undertaken a year after the former, as Vitringa and Rosenm. on Is. vii. with Hieron., Jarchi, and Buddeus (*h. eccl.* ii. p. 425) have represented the course of affairs, this cannot be determined with certainty, and does not materially affect the main point.[1]

[1] Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 142 ff.) and Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 217 f.) therefore err when they so put the matter, as if those who explain both narratives only of one campaign, understood them also, like Gesen., of one and the same event, and their counter reasons, so far as they have any force, only prove the diversity of the events, but not the existence

V. 6. "At that time Rezin brought Elath to Aram, which the Jews under Uzziah had regained, comp. on xiv. 22. By בָּעֵת הַהִיא this conquest is only placed in general in the course of the war of the Syrians with Ahaz, not necessarily after their campaign against Jerusalem. On the contrary it must have preceded it and occurred after the defeat of Ahaz's army (2 Chr. xxviii. 5) because Ahaz, by calling in the Assyrian, had forced Rezin to desist from the siege of Jerusalem, so that he had no time to penetrate farther south and make conquests in Edom. "And the Edomites came to Elath and dwelt there unto this day." Many expositors after the Chald., Syr., and Arab versions take אֲרוֹמִים only for another form of אֲרַמִּים Aramaeans, Syrians, and this appears at first sight to be suitable; but on a farther consideration of the matter this view proves to be untenable. For as the Syrian kingdom was destroyed very soon after this campaign, and the Syrians were carried into captivity (v. 9), they cannot have dwelt long in Elath; comp. Mov. Krit. Unters. p. 151. If, therefore, the words, "they dwelt there unto this day," are even taken from the annals of the kings, and do not originate first with the author of our books, yet they suit not the Aramaeans but only the Edomites. We prefer, therefore, with the LXX., Vulg., the Masor., and most expositors, even Rob. Pal. iii. p. 109, the reading אֱדוֹמִים Edomites, as the origin of the variant ארומים from אדומים may be easily explained by the foregoing ארם, whereas, in case it had originally stood ארמים, there is no conceivable reason for the origin of the reading אדומים, except perhaps an unthinking error of transcription. But אדומים by no means warrants us with L. Capell., Cler., Mich., Dathe, and others to change אֲרָם also into אֱדוֹם, as הֵשִׁיב does not necessarily imply an earlier possession. After the Edomites again came into possession of Elath, and by the

of two independent campaigns. Hävernick allowed himself to be led too much by the representations of Movers, as he did not observe that his line of argument so explains the predictions of Isaiah i. and ii. 4 as if the prophet had given a chronological account of these events, whereas these predictions are not even uttered in the times of Ahaz, as Häv. himself has elsewhere (Einl. ii. 2, p. 66 f.) proved, still less do they exclusively treat of them.

destruction of the Syrian power also became independent of them, they themselves invaded Judah and carried off spoil, 2 Chr. xxviii. 17.[1]

Vv. 7—9. In this strait Ahaz, without regarding the encouraging prediction of Is. vii., that the kings of Syria and Ephraim were only like firebrands still smoking, and, notwithstanding the warning of the prophet against an alliance with Assyria, applied to Tiglath Pileser, and by the transmission of the treasures of the temple and the palace purchased for himself the aid of the Assyrians, so that Tiglath Pileser advanced against Damascus and took it, slew king Rezin and carried the inhabitants of Damascus into captivity to Kir.[2] The time when Ahaz

[1] The Philistines also invaded Judah and conquered several towns of the low country (2 Chr. xxviii. 18), in order to avenge themselves for the humiliation they had received under Uzziah (2 Chr. xxvi. 6.) This account receives a striking confirmation from Is. xiv. 28—32, comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 494, Hitzig, Jesaj. p. 175, my apol. Vers. p. 240, and Havern. Einl. 2, 1, p. 219 f., as also our remarks on xviii. 8.

[2] Of the proceedings of Tiglath Pileser against the kingdom of Israel nothing is here said. Mov. (Krit. Unters. p. 154) thence concludes: "that no serious disaster befel it at that time," and, p. 133, rejects even the correct assumption, that the deportation of the inhabitants of Naphtali and Gilead took place after the conquest and exile of the Syrians, as "quite unfounded and obviously false, because the author of the Book of Kings would not have here passed it over in silence." But if any *argumentum e silentio* is quite unfounded and obviously false, so undoubtedly is this, which cannot be sustained by some misunderstood expressions of Isaiah (viii. 23 and xvii. 2.) According to Mov. this deportation of the Israelites by Tiglath Pileser, which is also confirmed by 1 Chr. v. 6 and 26, must have taken place *before* his expedition against Syria. But had Movers only considered the geographical relation of Syria and Gilead to Assyria he would have been convinced of the complete untenableness of his assertion. Or did he not know that there was no other military way from Assyria or Mesopotamia from which Tiglath Pileser must have come to hither Asia than that leading by Thapsacus over the Euphrates, and thence either by Emesa or Palmyra to Damascus, by which all the conquerors from upper Asia invaded Palestine (comp. C. Ritter's Erdk. Th. x. Asien Bd. vii. p. 11 and 1114), and thus that Tiglath Pileser could not reach either the land of Naphtali or Gilead without marching through the Syrian kingdom from Damascus? But our author did not require to mention this expedition here, because he had already related it, xv. 29, in the history of the kingdom of Israel. Besides, not to speak of the older interpreters, Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 352) has rightly connected

applied to Tiglath Pileser for help is not here distinctly given; but it lies in the nature of the thing, that he took this step when the enemies, after conquering his army, prepared to march to Jerusalem ere they made their appearance before this city; with which also Is. vii. and viii. agree, comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 69. הַקּוֹמִים עָלָי, "who rise up against me," that is, assault and make war upon me. With regard to the form קוֹמִים for קָמִים see Ew. Gr. § 326 p. 201.—קִיר Kir (Is. xxii. 6; Am. i. 5, ix. 7), which the Vulg. has erroneously understood of *Cyrene*, is, according to a conjecture made by Bochart (*Phal.* iv. 32), taken by Calm., Mich. (Spicil. ii. p. 121, *Suppl. ad lex.* p. 2191), Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 102 f.), Winer (R.W. ii. p. 777), Gesen. (*thes.* iii. 1210, and Comm. on Is. i. p. 688), and others, for the country along the river Kur (*Κῦρος*, *Κῦῤῥος* of the ancients), which unites with the Araxes and falls into the Caspian Sea. But as this river formed the boundary between Armenia Major, Iberia, and Albania (comp. Forbiger, Hdb. d. alten Geogr. 1844 ii. p. 74, 598), and thus flowed north of Armenia, this district can scarcely have belonged at that time to the Assyrian empire, as the murderers of Sennacherib fled to the land of Ararat, and, therefore, no doubt beyond the bounds of the Assyrian empire (xix. 37), and in general Armenia occurs in the Old Testament under the names of Ararat, Togarmah, and Minni. If we compare the collective passages in which mention is made of Kir, it is more natural according to Is. xxii. 6, where it is named along with Elam, and both nations are described as good archers, to think with Bochart (Phal. iv. 32) of the city *Κουρήνα* mentioned by Ptolemaeus vi. 2 on the river Mardus in the south of Media, as the borderers on the Mardus are celebrated as good archers (see C. Ritter's Erdk. viii. Asien vi. 1, p. 615), or still more probably with Vitringa on Is. xxii. 6 of the city *Καρίνη*, situated at all events in Media (Ptol. vi. 2), the present Kerend (see C. Ritter ix. As. vi. 2, p. 391), in favour

this captivity of the Israelites with the taking of Damascus by Tiglath Pileser as an event of the same war, although he has erroneously assumed that the captivity of the Naphtalites took place a campaign earlier, and formed the prelude to the other invasions of the Assyrians, in refutation of which Hitzig (Jesaj. p. 70) has appealed to the geographical relation of the two countries.

of which it may be added, that the Chald. in our passage has rendered קִיר by קְרִינָא. On the contrary Amos ix. 7, according to which the Aramaeans descended from Shem (Gen. x. 22) emigrated from Kir to Syria, might point to a district lying in the north of Mesopotamia or in Chaldaea rather than to a region beyond the Tigris: although we know far too little of the most ancient seats of the Shemitic races to lay much stress on this point. It is very possible that the original seat of the Shemites is to be sought in the upper highlands of the river Kerkha, on which Kerend lies (Ritter ix. p. 323 ff.), and that Kir was also situated there.

Vv. 10—16. While Tiglath Pileser remained at Damascus, Ahaz paid him a visit of homage, probably in order to make himself more secure of his favour. Here he saw an altar which pleased him, and sent therefore a sketch and model of it to Uriah the priest, with orders to build a similar altar in Jerusalem; which he had executed on the return of the king (vv. 10, 11.) On this altar Ahaz, after his return to Jerusalem, offered his burnt-offering, meat-offering, and drink-offering, and removed the altar of Solomon from its place on the north side of the court, and ordered Uriah the priest to perform all the sacrifices henceforth on his new altar (vv. 12—15.) And Uriah obeyed also this order (v. 16.)[1] Proceeding on the supposition that this new altar was dedicated to idols (a supposition which Theodore and Procop. entertained), the older interpreters endeavoured to answer the question, why Ahaz chose the gods, not of the victorious Assyrians, but of the vanquished Syrians. Seb. Schm. replies, *Nimirum jam agnoscebat Assyrium hostem potius quam amicum cum diis Assyriis: cogitabatque de ejusmodi diis, qui ipsum contra Assyrium et deos ejus defenderent. Ubi homo*

[1] If de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 252) finds this compliance of the priest "very scandalous," and seeks herein a proof of the non-existence of the Pentateuch, Häv. (Einl. i. 2, p. 597) has on the contrary replied with justice, that examples are not wanting of similar falsely submissive conduct on the part of the priests toward the king, and pointed to the fact, that the narrative implies no entire apostasy from Jehovah. But when he farther remarks, that Ahaz had distinguished this priest before as a favourite, the historical proofs of this are wanting, as Gesenius, to whose comm. on Is. viii. 2 he refers, only offers the conjecture, that "this priest appears to have stood high in his favour."

*stultus deos Syrorum, quos prius putabat adversus se fuisse validos, elegit potius quam Jehovam verum Deum. Quod vero dii Syri Rezinum non defendissent adversus Assyrios, pro sua cæcitate alii potius cuicunque casui, non infirmitati deorum istorum adscribebat.* But who could believe this? Had Ahaz then regarded the Assyrians as his enemies, he would not surely have paid a visit to Damascus. The whole supposition, that this altar was consecrated to the Syrian, or as some think, to the Assyrian gods, is false. According to the intention of the king it was to be consecrated to Jehovah, and therefore he caused it to be erected in the temple of Jehovah, and the sacrifices prescribed in the law to be offered on it (v. 15); and the reason why he wished to substitute it for Solomon's altar of burnt-offering lay simply in this, that it pleased him better than the old one of Solomon. That which was sinful in this was the *inepta ἐθελοθρησκεία*, as Budd. (hist. eccl. ii. p. 428) quite correctly designates the reason of this innovation, or that he, according to his idolatrous tendencies not regarding the difference between heathen and theocratic forms of worship, made arbitrary changes in the temple of Jehovah contrary to the command of the Lord, who, to guard against idolatry, did not commit the structure and forms of the places of worship built for his name to human fancy, and therefore revealed to Moses and David the patterns of the sanctuaries to be built for him (Ex. xxv. 40, xxiv. 30; 1 Chr. xxviii. 19.) Therefore was every altar erected by private choice compared to an altar of idols, even though it was not, like that of Ahaz, constructed after the model of an idolatrous altar.[1] The form דּוּמֶּשֶׂק appears to be merely an error of

[1] The passage, 2 Chr. xxviii. 23, "Ahaz sacrificed to the gods of Damascus, who smote him, and said, The gods of the kings of Aram, who help them, to them will I sacrifice, that they may help me. And they were the ruin of him and of all Israel," is perfectly reconcilable with what is above stated. For if the statement actually refer to this altar, it might be regarded as an explanation of the writer, who, regarding the inclination of the king as an act, designated the offerings on the altar, which was built after the model of an altar consecrated to the gods of Damascus, as really presented to these gods themselves. With much greater probability, however, the statement of Chronicles refers not to this altar, but to sacrifices which Ahaz actually offered on בָּמוֹת to the gods of Damascus, before he went to Damascus to Tig-

the pen for דַרְמֶשֶׂק 1 Chr. xviii. 5 f.; 2 Chr. xxviii. 23.—Uriah the priest is probably the same as the person, whom Isaiah (ch. viii. 2) was to take as witness of his prediction. דְמוּת likeness, תַּבְנִית pattern, model.—V. 13. The words, "and (Ahaz) burned his burnt-offering," etc., are not to be understood as if the king had himself in offering performed the functions belonging to the priests, but only that he caused offerings to be made for him on this altar by the obsequious priests, comp. v. 15.—The fourteenth verse, "And the brazen altar, which was before Jehovah, he brought from (its place) before the house of Jehovah, between the (new) altar and between the house of Jehovah, and put it on the north side of the (new) altar" are so misunderstood by the Rabb. and Vatabl., as if Ahaz had placed his new altar between the brazen altar and the porch of the temple on the north side; on the contrary Ahaz removed the altar of Solomon from its place, and had it conveyed to the north side of the court, and his new altar set in the place of the old before the middle of the temple. וַיַּקְרֵב means not *removit*, but *admovit*, and is connected with עַל־יֶרֶךְ וגו' notwithstanding the introduction of וַיִּתֵּן אֹתוֹ for the sake of greater clearness, as Maurer has rightly observed.—With respect to the article before the *nom. regens* in the *stat. constr.* הַמִּזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת, comp. Ew. Gr. § 514.—V. 15. All offerings, which the Mosaic law prescribed, as well the daily morning and evening sacrifice, as the special burnt-offerings, meat and drink-offerings to be presented by the king or the whole people, were henceforth to be offered on the new altar, and also the blood, as the law required in these offerings, was to be sprinkled upon it, from which it is evident, that this new altar was to supply altogether the place of the altar of burnt-offering consecrated to the Lord in the temple. Concerning

lath Pileser and before Tiglath Pileser took Damascus, and by the conquest of the Syrians according to the opinions of the heathen, exposed the weakness of their gods. The author of Chronicles has omitted the building of the new altar after the model of that at Damascus as of no importance in comparison with the other sins of Ahaz, but not, as de Wette asserted, to save the honour of the true worship. Comp. in reply to this assertion Hertz i. p. q. p. 107 ff. and my apol. Vers. p. 386 f.

the brazen altar Ahaz declares in the first instance only יִהְיֶה־לִּי לְבַקֵּר, "it will be for me to consider," that is, I shall bethink myself concerning it and then determine farther. On this meaning of בִּקֵּר see Prov. xx. 25.—The *Kethibh* יְצַוֵּהוּ requires no change; the *pron. suff.* stands before the *nomen*, as often especially in the broader popular language, comp. Ew. Gr. § 562.

Vv. 17, 18. Ahaz interfered also with the other articles in the court. He cut off the pannels from the bases and removed the laver from off them, took down the brazen sea also from the brazen oxen on which it stood, and placed it on the pavement of stones. קִצֵּץ, to cut off, is used xviii. 17, xxiv. 13, of the separation of the platings of massive gold, and denotes here also the separation or cutting away of the pannels adorned with sculpture. The ו before אֶת־הַכִּיֹּר can only have come into the text by an error of the pen. מַרְצֶפֶת אֲבָנִים is the floor of the court paved with stones probably in Mosaic work. Interpreters differ in opinion as to the object of Ahaz in interfering with these works of art. Cler. and Budd. *l.c.* think he perhaps used the copper for coining, or sold it for other objects, or sent it to the king of Assyria. But these conjectures are refuted by the circumstance that the bases and the brazen sea were still extant at the destruction of Jerusalem (xxv. 13, Jer. i. lii. 20), by which it appears distinctly enough that Ahaz neither melted, alienated, nor entirely destroyed them, nor in fact did anything more than what is here expressly stated, so that one of his successors, no doubt the pious Hezekiah, was able to restore them in his reformation of religion. There is much probability therefore in the conjecture of Züllig (die Cherubim-Wagen p. 56), that Ahaz wished not so much to destroy these things, as to employ the elaborate sculpture on the borders of the bases and the oxen of the brazen sea, in adorning another place, perhaps his own palace, perhaps an idol temple. For had he wished to destroy them, he would not have been contented with merely cutting off the panels from the bases or removing the brazen sea from the oxen on which it rested.[1] But, lastly, Ahaz went so far as to close the temple

[1] Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 66—68) has made quite new discoveries from our verses and some passages of Hosea. Thus from

doors, 2 Chr. xxviii. 24.—V. 18. "And the covered way of the Sabbath, which they had built at the house, and the outer entry of the king he removed into the house of the Lord on account of the king of Assyria." This notice is very obscure, because neither מֵיסַךְ הַשַּׁבָּת, nor מְבוֹא הַמֶּלֶךְ הַחִיצוֹנָה is mentioned anywhere else, and in general our accounts of the arrangement of the court of Solomon's temple are extremely defective. Of the different opinions enumerated by C. a Lap. and Calm. the most probable is that intimated by Grotius, that it was a covered portico, through which the priests entered the temple on the Sabbath *ad inchoandam ἐφημερίαν*, (comp. on מיסך Ges. *thes.* ii. 953), for to think with the Rabb. of a covered tent outside the temple, where the people whom the court could not contain assembled, is not a probable supposition. מבוא המלך החיצונה is a private external entrance for the king into the temple (see above p. 151), not, as some think, the royal station in the temple

Hos. x. 5, 6, and viii. 5, 6, he concludes, that the Assyrians *under Pul* removed the gods of Samaria, that is, the golden calves, and from Hos. viii. 4, and xiii. 2, that "the Israelites made new ones, which appear to have been afterwards carried away by the Assyrians (comp. 2 Ki. xxiii. 15, Judg. xviii. 30.)" He farther asserts, that *at the command of Tiglath Pileser (?)* Ahaz removed the brazen sea from the brazen oxen to a pediment of mere stones (comp. Ex. xx. 25, [?]), and "*likewise on account of the Assyrian king (?)* destroyed the oxen, cherubim, lions, palms on the scutcheons of the brazen bases in the court, and mutilated likewise the temple furniture (2 Chr. xxviii. 24)," and also removed the brazen altar of burnt-offering from its place to the north, in order to make room for the star worshippers to pay adoration to the sun, etc. Then from all this follow the conclusions, that symbols of animals were extremely distasteful to the Assyrians, and that the Assyrian star-worship quite coincided with the Persian, because Xerxes also removed the images from Greece as the Assyrians did from Syria and Palestine. Here at length indeed it occurs to him, that, according to 2 Ki. xvii. 30, the colonists transplanted by Esarhaddon to Samaria erected images of their native gods in the cities of Samaria, but he sets aside the objection to his assertions arising from this fact by the remark, that among the Assyro-Persian nations not the representation of the gods in general but only in human form (*ἀνθρωποειδῆ ἀγάλματα*, Beros. p. 69) was forbidden, while animal symbols were popular. Consequently, according to Movers' opinion, the golden calves, and the oxen, cherubims, lions of the brazen sea, and on the pannels of the bases were no animal symbols, but gods in human shape!! To controvert such absurd conclusions and groundless assertions would be an unprofitable waste of time!

court. So much is clear, that the covered way of the Sabbath as well as the external entrance of the king were outside the temple walls, and the change made by Ahaz consisted in removing it into the temple, מִפְּנֵי מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר from fear of the king of Assyria, that he might secure the entrance of the temple from him.[1]

Vv. 19, 20. With regard to the burial of the godless Ahaz, 2 Chr. xxviii. 27 states more precisely, that he was buried in the city of David, but not in the sepulchres of the kings.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

REIGN OF HOSHEA, THE LAST KING OF ISRAEL, TAKING OF SAMARIA AND REMOVAL OF THE ISRAELITES TO ASSYRIA AND MEDIA BY SHALMANESER, VV. 1—6; REFLECTIONS ON THE FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL, VV. 7—23; AND TRANSPLANTING OF HEATHEN COLONISTS INTO THE DEPOPULATED TERRITORY, VV. 24—41.

Vv. 1, 2. "In the twelfth year of Ahaz . . . . became Hoshea the son of Elah king, etc." As, according to xv. 30 Hoshea conspired against Pekah in the fourth year of Ahaz, slew him, and assumed to be king in his stead, but, according to our verse, he actually became king in the twelfth year of Ahaz, the throne must have been contested with him for eight years. Most interpreters and chronologists therefore have rightly assumed an anarchy of eight years between Pekah and Hoshea, inasmuch as the dates in our verse and in xv. 30 prove themselves to be co

[1] Ahaz evidently apprehended, as J. D. Mich. rightly conjectures that the king of Assyria called to his aid might take a fancy to make himself master of the city, and in that case a certain covered portico of the temple and an entrance into it from the outside might be of advantage to him in the siege of the city. This notice therefore with all its obscurity affords a sufficiently clear testimony to the truth of the statement of Chronicles, called in question by Ges. comm. on Is. i. p. 269 namely that the king of Assyria called to his aid by Ahaz did not help but oppress him.

rect by their agreement with the preceding and following chronological data, comp. on xv. 30 and xviii. 9 f.[1]—V. 2. "He did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him." Wherein Hoshea was favourably distinguished from his predecessors is not stated. Some Rabb. thought it was by this, that he did not prohibit his subjects, as the earlier kings of Israel, from visiting the temple at Jerusalem, as Hezekiah, according to 2 Chr. xxx. 10, invited the Israelites to the passover from the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulon, and according to vv. 11 and 18 also several from Ephraim and Manasseh, Assher, Issachar, and Zebulon, appeared at the feast. But this invitation to the passover took place after the conquest of Samaria and deportation of the greater part of the Israelites in the sixth year of Hezekiah, as is abundantly evident from 2 Chr. xxx. 6—9. At all events so much is implied in the words of our verse, that Hoshea was more anxious than his predecessors to reign theocratically, but wherein he showed this cannot be ascertained. Although less godless than the former kings of Israel, yet he could not escape the Divine judgment. *Solet nimirum Deus pœnam majorum differre ex sua longanimitate, si forte posteri seriam agant pœniten-*

[1] An interregnum of eight or nine years has been assumed by Ussher, *annal. m.* p. 51, *des Vign. Chronol.* i. p. 390 ff., Offerhaus, Bengel, Winer (R. W. i. p. 609), Tiele, Chronol. p. 73, and others. Comp. Budd. *hist. eccl.* ii. p. 417 ff., and Maurer, *commentatt. l. c.* p. 289. On the contrary several Rabb., Vatabl. and Grot., were of opinion, that Hoshea was subjected by the Assyrian king from the fourth to the twelth year of Ahaz, and therefore these years were not reckoned as years of his reign till the time when he revolted from him. Lastly, according to Lightfoot (*Op.* i. p. 103), no king of Samaria was mentioned in the period from the fourth to the twelfth year of Ahaz, *quia Hoseas nondum constabilitus erat in throno sed cohibitus per Assyrium usque ad annum duodecimum Achasi, quo demum tempore illum ibi regem constituit.* But both assumptions are at variance with v. 3, in conformity with which Shalmaneser made Hoshea subject and tributary to him after he became king, which cannot be understood of the time before the twelfth year of Ahaz. Besides, in all probability Tiglath Pileser was still reigning in the fourth year of Ahaz, and was only returned to his dominions after the removal of the Syrians and Gileadites. And even if Tiglath Pileser was then dead, his successor could not have already appeared in the land of Israel, either to conquer Hoshea or to oppose his accession to the throne.

*tiam, quod si non fit, etsi hi minus mali sint, ad vindictam tanden procedit ira Dei, coll. Ex.* xx. 5. S. Schm.

V. 3. "Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria." The old theologians find the occasion of this expedition of Shalmaneser against Hoshea in this, that Hoshea refused any longer to pay the tribute imposed on the Israelites by Pul in the time of Menahem. But this opinion has been justly rejected by Maurer as unfounded, because xv. 19 speaks only of a single payment of Menahem to Pul, inasmuch as it is there written וַיִּתֵּן not וַיָּשֶׁב, as here and elsewhere, thus iii. 4; 2 Chr. xxvii. 5; Ps lxxii. 10, where yearly tribute is intended. Maurer himself thinks that Shalmaneser came up, *aut ab Hoseae quodam aemulo in auxilium arcessitus, aut quia Hosea in appetendo regno Assyriorum praesidio ipse usus erat, sed voti compos factus conditionem, quacum erat regnum adeptus, omiserat.* This also is quite improbable and nowhere intimated. Why should we not seek the ground at once in the thirst of conquest of the Assyrians?— שַׁלְמַנְאֶסֶר, with which Gesen. compares the Pers. شرمان آذر *verecundus erga ignem,* according to Hos. x. 14, where he is called שַׁלְמַן, devastated the fenced city בית ארבאל, that is, the strongly fortified city Arbela in Galilee, known from 1 Macc. 9, 2, and Josephus (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 282), obviously in his here mentioned first expedition against the kingdom of the ten tribes, in which he made Hoshea subject (עֶבֶד) to him and compelled him to pay tribute (מִנְחָה, see above p. 54 f.) This expedition falls in the beginning of the reign of Hoshea; for he paid this tribute several years (שָׁנָה בְשָׁנָה v. 4), until he refused it, which took place in the sixth year of his reign, as Shalmaneser again appeared before Samaria in the beginning of the seventh year of it, v. 4.

Vv. 4—6. Hoshea sought help against the Assyrians in a treaty with the Egyptian king סוא (perhaps to be read סֶוֶא), that is, Ζευεχός in Manetho, the son of Sabakos of Ethiopian descent, the second king of the twenty-fifth dynasty, whom Rosselini thinks he has recognised in a royal figure at Thebes; comp. Vitr. *Comment. in Jes.* ii., p. 318, Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 596, and *thes.* ii. 940, Archinard, *chronol.* p. 68 and Häv.

Einl. ii. 2, p. 76.[1]—As soon as Shalmaneser learned Hoshea's defection, which is called קֶשֶׁר as rebellion against his acknowledged sovereign, in particular that he had sent messengers to the Egyptian king So and refused the farther payment of the tribute, he seized and laid him up bound in prison, over-ran his whole territory, advanced to Samaria his capital, besieged it three years, took it at length in the ninth year of Hoshea, and carried away Israel to Assyria and Media. According to this view of the history, which simply follows the text of vv. 4—6, Hoshea was already seized and imprisoned before the siege of Samaria. On the contrary, the difficulty is at once raised, how Shalmaneser could make himself master of his person before the taking of the capital, and then the question arises, where he left him bound. This question the expositors have not answered, but S. Schm. has obviated the difficulty by the assumption, that Shalmaneser fought a battle with him before the occupation of the country and the siege of the capital, and in it took him captive.

[1] Others, as Ussher, *Annal.* p. 52, Marsham, *Can. chron.* p. 485, take him to be Σαβακῶς (Herod. ii. c. 137 and 139) the first king of the Ethiopian race and father of Sevechos; but chronology decides against it. For as in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (Is. xxxvi. 1) Tirhakah advanced against Sennacherib, Sabakos cannot have been reigning in the third or fourth year of Hezekiah, inasmuch as Tirhakah's predecessor Sevechos reigned according to Euseb. twelve, according to Syncell. fourteen years; comp. Archin. *l. c.* p. 67.—Still less can So be identical with Ζήτ (of Manetho and Jul. Afric. in Syncell. i. 138 ed. Dind.) or Σεθὼς (Herod. ii. c. 141), as Hitzig on Is. p. 221 thinks to prove; because the names are too different. For the abbreviation affirmed by Hitzig of סוֹא from סוֹת cannot be proved by the forms זוֹ and זוּ used for זֹאת, because (*a*) it is questionable whether these forms are to be taken with Ewald (Gr. § 446) and Hitzig for abbreviations of זֹאת and are not much rather independent forms, as Hupfeld in Lassen's Ztschr. ii. p. 431 f. supposes, and (*b*) because even if the former were the case, the ת in the present instance is an appended formative letter, the falling away of which cannot establish the presumed change of ת into א. The designation also of So as king of Egypt in comparison with Tirhakah, who, xix. 9, is styled king of Cush (Ethiopia), proves nothing for Sethos and against Sevechos, as the Ethiopian dynasty, to which Sevechos belonged, at all events ruled over a great part of Egypt. In fine, the other combinations of Hitzig in favour of his assumption may, in the great obscurity of the Egyptian history at this period, be opposed by other combinations of equal probability and weight, as has been done by Gesen. and Knobel on Is. xix.

As nothing of this is mentioned, however, many expositors, from R. Levi ben Gers. to Maurer, have supposed that Hoshea was only taken captive on the conquest of Samaria, whereby, moreover, it is not necessary to take ויעל (v. 5) as a pluperfect, as Maur. has shown. For *veri utique similius est, Hoseam imminente hostili exercitu in Samariam se recepisse, Aegyptiorum fretum auxilio, quam Salmanassari obviam profectum in aperto campo eum eo conflixisse.* Maur. This supposition is certainly more probable, but whether it be therefore historically true cannot be decided on account of the brevity of the narrative. Budd. is therefore right also in saying, *ut ab ordine a scriptore sacro observato recedamus, nulla nos cogit necessitas* (*h. eccl.* ii. p. 418.) Whether, meanwhile, we decide for the former or the latter opinion, we must agree, that Hoshea after his capture was carried to Assyria, and there put in prison.—V. 5. The three years of the siege of Samaria were not full years, for, according to xviii. 9 f., it began in the seventh year of Hoshea, and the town was taken in the ninth, although is is there also said to have lasted *circa* three years. The ninth year of Hoshea corresponds with the sixth of Hezekiah (xviii. 10), or the year 722 or 721 B.C., in which the kingdom of the ten tribes was destroyed, see above p. 186.—"He carried them into captivity to Asshur," that is, into the land of Assyria; for he assigned them dwelling places in the lands of Assyria proper and in the cities of Media.[1] חֲלַח is probably Καλαχηνή or Καλαχανή (in Ptolem. vi. 1 called Καλακίνη), the most north-western province of Assyria between the Tigris, the Armenian border mountain Niphates, and the

[1] Pul and Tiglath Pileser had already removed the transjordanic tribes of Israel (2 Ki. xv. 29) to Assyria, and indeed to Halah, Habor, Hara, and the river Gozan (1 Chr. v. 26.) This statement of Chron. deviates from our present one only in this, that Habor is distinguished as a country from the river Gozan and הרא Hara is named in addition. הרא probably denotes the Median highlands in the neighbourhood of the mountain Chaboras, the district of the Persian Irak, which the Arabs call الجبال *montanum*, the Persians كوهستان ; comp Boch. Phal. iii. 14, Rosenm. Althk. i. 1, p. 295, and Ges. *thes.* i. 392. Moreover, Gesen. (*thes.* i. 176) and Winer (R.W. i. p. 515) quite arbitrarily describe these deviations of Chron. from our verse as *negligentia rerumque geographicarum imperitia* of the writer of Chronicles, not reflecting, that the two passages speak of different deportations.

river Lycus, that is, the greater Zab (comp. Forbiger i. p. q. ii. p. 609, and, on the country along the greater Zab, Ritter's Erdk. ix. p. 639 ff.) So Bochart, *Phal.* iii. c. 14, Mich. *Supplem.* p. 767, Ges. *thes.* i. 476, Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 94, 113. On the contrary Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 98 f. and 120 takes חלח to be identical with the Syr. ܚܠܘܢ, ܚܘܠܘܢ, حلوان, a city, according to Abulf. in Busching's Magaz. iv. p. 262 and Assemanni (*bibl. or.* iii. 2, p. 418 f.), five days' journey north of Bagdad, from which probably the district bordering on the Zagros has received the name Χαλωνῖτις or Καλωνῖτις (see Forbig. p. 610 and 614.) It is scarcely possible to decide between these two places; only the identification of our חֲלַח and כֶּלַח the city of Assyria built by Nimrod (Gen. x. 11) by Ges. (*thes.* ii. 688), Tuch, Comm. on Gen. p. 239 and others, appears to me unfounded, and the distinction of the two by Mich. *l.c.* and Rosenm. i. p. q. p. 99 to be much rather established, while, however, it may certainly be questioned, whether חלח denotes Calachene and כלח Cholwan, Chalonitis, as Mich. thinks probable, or the contrary assumption of Rosenm. is more correct. On Cholwan, Holwan, comp. Ritter's Erdk. ix. p. 464 f. and 469 ff., who here p. 470 f. declares himself for the identity of חלח with Holwan.

חָבוֹר Chabor is (*a*) a mountain, the boundary range between Assyria and Media, ὁ Χαβώρας τὸ ὄρος in Ptol. vi. 1, a branch of the *montes Gordiaei* or *Carduchii* (see Wahl. anc. and mod. hither and central Asia i. p. 818 f.), which continues in a south-easterly direction from the south-east corner of lake Van to the south-west of lake Urumia, where, at the present day, in the district of the Hakary tribes, not far from the residence of the patriarch of the independent Nestorians, a mountain *Habor* is found (see The Nestorians, or the ten tribes, by Asahel Grant, translated by S. Preiswerk, Basle, 1843. p. 59); (*b*) a river still called Khabur, which, rising at the foot of this mountain above Julamerk, flows in a south-westerly direction to the Tigris, and first pointed out by A. Schultens (*ind. geogr. ad vit. Sal. s.v.*) from a passage of Jakuti also communicated by Mich. (*suppl.* p. 665), afterwards described by Wahl i. p. q. 718 and more exactly after the statements of Dr Rich and Dr Grant by Ritter (Erdk.

ix. p. 716 and 1030.) See also Grant, The Nestor. p. 40, and the map accompanying this work. This river flows through the middle of the province Kalachene. The word חָבוֹר only three times mentioned in the Old Testament, denotes, 1 Chr. v. 26, the mountain Chaboras, but in our verse, and the parallel passage xviii. 11, the river Khabur, as the term in apposition with it, river of Gozan, demands. On the contrary, Mich. (*Suppl.* p. 280 f.), Winer (R.W. i. p. 253), Ges. (*thes.* i. 442), Havern. (Comm. on Ez. p. 15) and others, also Ritter (Erdk. x. p. 248), understand חבור of the river Chaboras (in Ptol. *Χαβώρας*, in Strabo and others *Ἀβόῤῥας*, *Aboras*, in Plin. Chabura, in Abulf. and Edrisi خابور in the Syr. ܟܒܪ and ܟܒܘܪ), which rises under the Masian chain at Ras el Ain (راس العين), flows first through upper Mesopotamia in a south-easterly direction parallel to the two principal rivers, then turns to the south-west, and at Kerkesi, Circesium, Carchemish falls into the Euphrates (see Forb. i. p. q. p. 627.) But this river is called כְּבָר in Ezek. i. 3, iii. 15 etc. According to the analogy of the Syriac we might certainly take חבור and כבר only for different names of the same river, if only there were cogent reasons for this assumption. But these are wanting. The only plausible reason[1] is derived from the addition

[1] Hävern., indeed (Comm. on Ezek. p. 16 and 43) finds a proof also of the identity of כבר with our חבור in Ezek ii. 15, inasmuch as he so explains this verse: "And I came to the captives at Tel-abib, that dwelt by the river Chebar, and where they sat, there sat I seven days silent among them," as if it referred to earlier and later Israelitish settlers in this region, from which he then further infers, that colonists of the kingdom of the ten tribes had been already brought to this river. But it is manifest that this is not intended, according to the ordinary correct rendering of this verse, as we find it in the Chald., Syr., and Vulg. But even, according to the rendering preferred by Häv., "who settled at the river Chebar and dwelt there," the words imply no contrast of earlier Israelitish and later Jewish settlers, which is only imported by an arbitrary exposition of the words אֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה יוֹשְׁבִים שָׁם, "who *already*, that is a long time before, dwelt there." Häv., indeed, thinks to justify the arbitrary insertion of "*already*" by a Syrian phrase quoted from Assemanni, but has not observed that in this the opposition is clearly enough indicated by the antithesis of the *praeter.* and the *partic. praes.*

נְהַר גּוֹזָן. The above named theologians, whom Ritter has followed, find Gozan in the district Γαυζανῖτις, situated, according to Ptol. v. 18, between the rivers Chaboras and Saccoras, now Kaushan, according to which the river of Gozan must no doubt be the Mesopotamian Chaboras. But, however much this opinion appears to be recommended by our finding here all the localities together (Ritter i. p. q.), yet grave objections to it arise on a closer consideration of the matter. In the first place the order, in which according to this view the places are named, must appear strange, Assyria, Mesopotamia and the cities of Media; why should the writer not have given the three provinces to which the Israelites were removed, according to their natural order as regarded from Palestine, Mesopotamia, Assyria, and Media? Why should he also have thought it necessary to add to חבור the more precise determination, river of Gozan, since the Chaboras falling into the Euphrates could have greater importance neither for him nor his reader than the land of Halah certainly still more unknown to the Israelites and Jews? Why should he not, as the exiles could only inhabit the land along the river, have rather named the country itself, and at most appended the river flowing through it as a farther determination of the country? Lastly, it is in the highest degree improbable, that the Assyrian should have transplanted the deported Israelites into dependent provinces.[1] The policy of these conquerors leads us rather to expect that Shalmaneser, as Pul and Tigiath Pileser (xv. 29, and 1 Chr. v. 26), transplanted the ten tribes not partly to Mesopotamia, but altogether to Assyria and Media, especially as only Assyria and the cities of Media are mentioned, and Assyria, where it is used in the Old Testament of a country, never occurs in the wider sense of the Greeks, as including Mesopotamia or Aram Naharaim (comp. on xxiii. 29.) Even Winer, although he finds חבור and גוזן in Mesopo-

[1] It is also probable, from political grounds, that the Israelites were transplanted into the centre of the Assyrian kingdom. A population that is carried away from its home on account of continued seditions, is not removed to a land bordering on other scarcely subjugated tribes, but is taken rather into the interior of the old country, where it cannot move without being under immediate inspection. Preiswerk on Grant's Nestor. p. 108, note.

tamia, cannot refrain from remarking, that "the Gozan of our passage points to Assyria, as that of xix. 12 to Mesopotamia" (R.W. i. p. 515.) But even in xix. 12 it is questionable, whether Gozan is to be sought in Mesopotamia; in our verse חבור נהר גוזן is certainly identical with خابور الحسنية *Chabur Chasaniae*, as Jakiti names the Assyrian Khabur in contradistinction to the Mesopotamian. For the same reason evidently נהר גוזן is here added to חבור, and גוזן denotes not Gauzanitis in Mesopotamia but an Assyrian district.[1] حسنية would indeed correspond still more to the Hebrew גוזן, if we read with Wahl. i. p. q. p. 718 according to a conjecture thrown out by Mich. (*suppl.* p. 666) جسنية, as ح and ج are frequently exchanged in the manuscripts; though this change is not absolutely necessary, as analogies also exist for the interchange of ג and ح (see Gesen. *thes.* i. 252.) The original signification of גוזן we cannot at present ascertain farther. But it is not impossible that the name Gozan is preserved in the word Zozan, by which, according to the testimony of Dr Grant, the Nestorians denote all highlands of Assyria, where they find pastures for their flocks (see Grant, the Nestor. p. 110), as the transition of *g* (ג) into *z* (צ) occurs in the Shem-

[1] Moreover, how far the similarity of the Hebrew גוזן with the Greek Γαυζαν is from affording a valid proof of its identity with the Mesopotamian district Γαυζανῖτις, may be inferred from this, that Ptolemaeus (vi. 2) also mentions a town of the name of Γαυζανία in Media between the chain of Chaboras and the Caspian Sea, which Boch. (Phal. iii. 14), Rennell (Geogr. of Herod. vol. i. p. 521, ed. 2) and Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 102 comp. with i. 1, p. 295) identify with Gozan, according to which the latter two find the river of Gozan in the Kizil-Ozien in the northern declivity of the Kurdish chain (the Zagros), which are called the Abbas Bei mountains, and flowing into the Caspian Sea (comp. Ritter's Erdk. viii. p. 615 f.) This assumption, which Ritter also, i. p. q. p. 590 thinks probable, although he afterwards (x. p. 248) declares himself against it, might at all events suit 1 Chr. v. 26, where the river of Gozan is distinguished from Habor, but is not necessary even there, and in no case entitles us to explain our passage according to it, as an earlier deportation is then spoken of. We take the river of Gozan, also in 1 Chr. v. 26, for the Assyrian Khabur, and do not identify the city Gauzania with Gozan, but merely regard it as a proof that the name Gauzan = Gozan occurred also out of Mesopotamia.

itic dialects (comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1144), but in Sanscrit *c′* (*ch*, *z*) passes according to definite euphonic laws regularly into *k* and farther into *g*, and in reduplicated forms inversely *k* and *g* into c′ and g′ (*j*).

Vv. 7—23. To the narrative of the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes and the removal of its inhabitants into exile, the author of our books appends some thoughts on the causes which brought this end on the greater portion of the covenant people, and finds them in the revolt of Israel from Jehovah his God, in his idolatry, in his disregard of the voice of the prophets by whom the Lord would have recalled the backsliders to himself, lastly in the separation of the ten tribes from the house of David by Jeroboam, and the worship of the calves introduced by him. These reflections rest altogether on the Mosaic law and the Pentateuch, so that they furnish a very strong testimony for its existence, not merely in the times of the author of our books, in the Babylonish exile, but also during the whole period of the subsistence of the kingdom of the ten tribes; indeed they have the Mosaic origin of the whole law for their postulate, inasmuch as only on this postulate could the revolt of the ten tribes and their continued opposition to the will of God revealed in the law and by the prophets be regarded and pronounced to be the sole cause of their final rejection from the presence of the Lord.—V. 7. וַיְהִי "and it came to pass," that is, the previously related fall of the kingdom together with the removal of its inhabitants took place, because . . . . In order to set forth more clearly the guilt of this apostasy, mention is made of the great goodness by which God had bound his people to thankfulness in the expression of a sincere and devoted worship, of their deliverance from Egypt, from the power of Pharaoh, as in the first commandment (Ex. xx. 2; Deut. v. 6), according to which sin is also described as a fearing of *other gods*. Comp. also Lev. xi. 45; Jos. xii. 17; Ps. lxxxi. 11; Jer. ii. 6, and on מִתַּחַת יַד פַּרְעֹה Ex. xviii. 10.—V. 8. The sin of Israel against his God is again described as "walking in the statutes of the Canaanites and of the kings of Israel whom they had made." These two kinds of sin are then more particularly developed in vv. 9—20 and 21—23. חֻקּוֹת הַגּוֹיִם וגו׳ form the antithesis to the חֻקּוֹת יְהוָֹה, in which Israel

was to walk, Lev. xviii. 4, 5, 26, xix. 19, 37, xx. 8, 22. In form the words agree most closely with Lev. xx. 23. The phrase הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הוֹרִישׁ וגו' often occurring in our books (1 Ki. xiv. 24, xxi. 26; 2 Ki. xvi. 3, xxi. 2) is from Deut. xi. 23 comp. xviii. 12.—"And of the kings, whom they had made," that is, the Lord their God had not chosen them, Deut. xvii. 15.—V. 9. וַיְחַפְּאוּ "the children of Israel *covered* words, with regard to which it was not so with Jehovah their God," that is, they ventured by a multitude of perversions and trifling interpretations of his word to conceal his true nature. Thus Hengstenb. (Beitr. ii. p. 176 and Christol. iii. p. 9) has rightly explained חפא, which most interpreters have so grievously misunderstood, that some have taken it for secret blasphemy against God (Chald., Syr., Grot., Cler.), others for committing acts of treachery (*perfide egerunt res quae non rectae erant in Jehovam.* Ges. *thes.* i. 505), others still, as Deres., for the commission of secret sins.—"And built them altars of high places in all their cities." The author of our books has indeed mentioned nothing of this in the history of this kingdom; but from the illegal calf-worship introduced by the kings it may be inferred, that the people also recklessly followed their inclinations in the erection of their own altars of the high places, which could not be entirely suppressed even in Judah, where the temple and temple-worship sanctioned by the Lord himself were still extant, though the altars at Dan and Bethel were also nothing but בָּמוֹת, 1 Ki. xii. 31. The words recurring in xviii. 8, "from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," are a proverbial description of universality, as much as to say, from the smallest town or hamlet to the greatest cities, in all places where men dwelt. מִגְדַּל נֹצְרִים is a tower built for the protection of the flocks in steppes and deserts, 2 Chr. xxvi. 10. On v. 10 comp. 1 Ki. xiv. 23.—V. 11. "They wrought wicked things to provoke Jehovah;" this refers to the sins of idolatry.—V. 12. גִּלֻּלִים (xxi. 21, xxiii. 24; 1 Ki. xv. 12, xxi. 26) is taken from Lev. xxvi. 30, and Deut. xxix. 16, and denotes not *stercorei*, *sordidi*, *impuri*, as the Rabb. explain it (see Ges. *thes.* i. 287), but first, stones, stone masses, as the Chald. גְּלָל, Ezr. v. 8, vi. 4, and the Syr. ܓܠܠܐ *lapides*, Job viii.

17, the stones and stone masses dedicated to the gods, the stone images of the gods, lastly in a contemptuous sense the gods themselves. The original meaning is still evident in Lev. xxvi. 30, "I will destroy your high places, and cut down your sun pillars, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your גִּלֻּלִים dead stone masses;" the transition to the signification of gods is shown in Deut. xxix. 16, "and ye have seen their abominations and אֶת גִּלֻּלֵיהֶם their gods, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were with them." Besides these places of the Pentateuch the word occurs only in the passages quoted from our books and Jer. l. 2, and very frequently (forty times) in Ezekiel. Comp. Häv. on Ezek. p. 75 f.—The words, "whereof the Lord had said unto them, Ye shall not do this," allude to passages of the law, as Ex. xx. 2 ff., xxiii. 13; Lev. xxvi. 1, etc.—V. 13 ff. But the Lord did not rest satisfied with the law, but testified against Israel and Judah by all his prophets, and admonished them to turn from their evil ways and observe his commandments; nevertheless they hearkened not, hardened themselves as their fathers, rejected their commandments, the covenant and the testimony of the Lord, and went after vain idols to worship them. In v. 13 Judah is named with Israel, although here the causes of Israel's rejection only are unfolded, to intimate before hand the like fortune, that Judah also was preparing for himself although his rejection occurred only at a subsequent period, as is more distinctly expressed in vv. 19 and 20. בְּיַד כָּל־נְבִיאָו כָּל־חֹזֶה "by all his prophets, every seer." כל חוזה is appended to כל נביאו, to express emphatically the whole of the prophets of every kind, whom the Lord had sent since the time of Moses. The emendation therefore proposed by Ew. Kr. Gr. 295 and Hitzig, Bgr. d. Krit. p. 127 כָּל־נָבִיא וְכָל־חֹזֶה is unnecessary, although its sounds well on account of its easiness, comp. Maur. *ad h. l.*—V. 14. The words, וַיַּקְשׁוּ אֶת־עָרְפָּם, "they hardened their necks, were stiff-necked," are derived from Deut. x. 16, and formed after the phrase קְשֵׁה עֹרֶף, "of a hard neck, stiff-necked," (Ex. xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 5, xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 6—13, xxxi. 27).—V. 15. The phrase, "they went after vanity and became vain" (Jer. ii. 5) denotes the nullity of the whole life and strife with

respect to the chief end of man, his relation to God. All that man proposes except God as the object of his life is הֶבֶל (comp. Deut. xxxii. 21), is idolatry and leads to vanity, to spiritual and moral corruption, Rom. i. 21. The last words of the verse refer to Lev. xviii. 3.—In vv. 16 and 17 the idolatrous course of the Israelites, the worship of the calves, Asherah and Baal, and other superstitious practices, are likewise described with reference to the warnings of the Pentateuch against them. The golden calves (1 Ki. xii. 28) are called מַסֵּכָה after Ex. xxxii. 4, 8; Deut. ix. 12—17. On Asherah and Baal comp. 1 Ki. xvi. 32 f. —Of the worship of the whole host of heaven (sun, moon, and stars) nothing occurs in the *history* of the kingdom of the ten tribes; this worship is first mentioned as a historical fact under Manasseh (xxi. 3.) Our author has here merely borrowed the expression from Deut. iv. 19, and xvii. 3, without meaning thereby to indicate a new, though not previously mentioned, species of idolatry among the ten tribes, as the host of heaven was indeed implicitly worshipped in Baal and Asherah, as divinities of sidereal power; see on xxi. 3. The whole first half of v. 17 is formed after Deut. xviii. 10, where the worship of Molech is prohibited in conjunction with soothsaying and divination. Neither is there any mention of the worship of Molech in the history of the ten tribes; but it may still have appeared at least here and there in its closing period, when Ahaz introduced it also into Judah (xvi. 3.) קֶסֶם soothsaying, *μαντεία*. נִחֵשׁ, which is used 1 Ki. xx. 33 in a tropical sense, comes from נָחָשׁ, a serpent, and means *omen ex serpentibus petere*, but is then used of divination in general. Comp. Boch. *Hieroz.* i. p. 20 ff., where the testimonies of the ancients concerning *ὀφιομαντεία* are collected, and Hengstenb. d. Gesch. Bil. p. 122 f.—Concerning הִתְמַכֵּר see on 1 Ki. xxi. 20.—V. 18. "The tribe of Judah alone" means the kingdom of Judah, see above p. 171 ff.—Vv. 20 and 21 are a parenthetical explanation of the sentence, "he left only the tribe of Judah alone," namely, at that time, for afterwards Judah also was cast off, because he followed the statutes of Israel, comp. ch. xxiv. and xxv. כָּל־זֶרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל all Israel of the twelve tribes, not merely the ten tribes as S. Schm., Calm., and others think. The כִּי (v. 21) is connected with v. 18,—the Lord cast off Israel,

only Judah remained, *for* Israel had rent (the kingdom) from the house of David, 1 Ki. 31, xii. 20.—וידא is to be read וַיַּדַּא from נדא = נדד for ויד, "he made to flee, give way" that is, drew away Israel from the Lord. The *Keri* וַיַּדַּח gives the same sense, but is an unnecessary emendation.—V. 23. The removal (הֵסִיר) or rejection (הִשְׁלִיךְ v. 20) out of the sight of the Lord signifies the abolition of the relation of grace, into which the Lord had entered with Israel by his covenant, the withdrawal of his grace, the necessary consequence of which was the expulsion of the people from the Lord's land. This expulsion endured "unto this day," that is, until the composition of our books.[1]

[1] As the Hebrew עַד like the German *bis* (until) is not always used in an exclusive sense, but often also abstracted from that, which lies beyond the prescribed *terminus ad quem*, it by no means follows from the words, "The Lord removed Israel out of his sight . . . . . *until this day*," that the ten tribes returned to their native land after the time of the composition of our books about the middle of the sixth century B.C. Yet as little can the opposite widely spread opinion be established, namely, that they lived unto this day as a collective body in the exile. It is well known, how often men have wished to discover the ten tribes long regarded as lost, now in the numerous Jewish communities in the south of Arabia, now in India, particularly in Malabar, now in China, Turkestan, and Kashmir, or in Affghanistan, (see the proofs in Ritter's Erdk. x. p. 246), nay, in America, until recently Dr Grant (the Nestorians or the ten tribes) thought he had found them again in the independent Nestorians and Jews living among them; whereas others, as Witsius (Δεκάφ. c. iv. ff.), J. D. Mich. *(de exilio decem trib. comm.* iii.) and lastly Robinson in the treatise (the Nestorians, etc., New York, 1841) quoted by Ritter i. p. q. p. 285, and only thence known to me, endeavoured to prove, that they had been long since lost, partly by being mingled in the Babylonish exile with the Jews, and to some extent attached to the exiles brought back by Zerubbabel and Ezra to Palestine, partly afterwards by intermixture with the remaining Jews who were scattered over all the world after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and partly by conversion to Christianity, so that all attempts to discover any where the remainder of the ten tribes are vain. This view is correct, although its advocate has mixed its valid grounds with much that is untenable. For if we consider the arguments brought forward by Grant for his hypothesis, *(a)*, that we have not the slightest historical trace of the ten tribes having ever left Assyria, *(b)*, that they did not return with the return from the Babylonish captivity, *(c)*, that they were still found in the land of their exile according to Josephus (Antiq. xi. 5, 2) in

Vv. 24—41. *The Samaritans and their idolatry.* V. 24. After

the first, and according to Hieron. (Comm. on the proph.) in the fifth century, *(d)* and, lastly, that they were to this day in territory of the Old Assyria, inasmuch as the Nestorians as well by their own accounts as by those of the Jews dwelling there are Beni Israel, and no doubt of the ten tribes, as they prove themselves to be Israelites by still retaining several Mosaic customs and usages (the Nestor. p. 113 ff.); we find, that *(d)* only proves that the Nestorians are of Jewish extraction, but not they are remainder of the ten tribes, for their own accounts lose their weight from the fact that the Jews of other countries profess the same of themselves. Farther, the statements of Josephus and Hieron. *(c)* cannot be regarded as historically accredited testimonies, but are only conclusions built on the one hand upon the failure of distinct historical accounts of the return of the ten tribes, on the other hand upon the fact that in the times of these writers many Jews or Israelites lived in Assyria and Persia. So much also, and no more, follows from the saying from king Agrippa reported by Josephus (*de bell. Jud.* ii. 16, 4), not to build in the contemplative revolt on τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀδιαβηνῆς ὁμοφύλους and their aid. Lastly, with regard to the reasons *a* and *b*, the want of definite historical accounts concerning the return of the ten tribes cannot prove much as an *argumentum e silentio*, and is, moreover, weakened by the erroneous presupposition lying at the foundation of it, that the ten tribes never came into contact with the Jews carried away in the Babylonish exile, but remained unmingled and sequestered from them, and could not have returned, if not with Zerubbabel and Ezra, at a later period to their fatherland. The predictions quoted by Ritter, p. 250, probably after Robinson, Jer. l. 4, 5, 17, 19; Ezek. xxxvii. 11 ff., as well as the prophetic sentence cited by Witsius *l. c. c.* v. § 11—11; Is. xiv. 1; Mic. ii. 12; Jer. iii. 20, xxx. 3 f., xxxiii. 7 f., certainly prove very little for the contrary opinion, because they refer mostly to the Messianic times, and are to be understood in a spiritual sense; but from the books of Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, thus much at least appears, that the Jews carried away by Nebuchadnezzar were scattered not merely in the province of Babylonia, but in the various districts of the Chaldean, formerly Assyrian, afterwards Persian kingdom beyond the Euphrates, whereby with the discontinuance of the distinction kept up by the policy of the kings of Israel the old separation also must have disappeared, and a closer bond have grown up among all the descendants of Jacob from their common unhappy lot of dispersion among the heathen; since the Persian kings could know no distinction between Israelites and Jews, and under Xerxes, the grand Vizier, Haman wished to destroy all the Jews (not merely the tribe of Judah, but all the Hebrews.) Farther the edicts of Cyrus, Ezr. i. 1—4, "whoever is among you of *all* his people, his God be with him, and let him go up," etc., and of Artaxerxes, Ezr. vii. 13, "whoever *of the people of Israel* in my realm is willing," gave permission to all Israelites of the twelve tribes to return to Palestine, and who could assert with reason, that none of the ten tribes availed themselves of this permission? If, on the contrary,

the removal of the Israelites, the king Assyria transplanted heathen colonists from several provinces of his kingdom into the cities of Samaria. By the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר most interpreters understand Shalmaneser, who removed the Israelites, because he only is

Grant remarks, that "of the 50,000, whom Cyrus sent back to their country, it is expressly said that they were of those "whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away to Babylon" (Ezr. ii. 1), with which we may also compare i. 5, "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites," etc., these words apply no doubt to the majority of the exiles who returned, and prove that the ten tribes did not return as a people to Palestine, but by no means that the great number of returning citizens of the former kingdom of Judah might not be accompanied with a considerable body of members of the remaining tribes; as Lightfoot (*hor. Hebr. in. ep.* i. *ad Cor. Addenda ad C.* 14; *Op.* ii. p. 929) and Witsius *l.c.* p. 346, and long before them the Rabb. in Seder Ol. rab. c. 29, p. 86, have concluded from the fact, that the sum of the persons and families separately named in Ezra ii. amounts only to 30,360 individuals, whereas the total number of those who returned is stated in v. 64 at 42,360, besides 7337 servants and maids, the inference, that this surplus above the families of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, mentioned by name, might have been of the ten tribes. To this it is added, that those who returned regard themselves as the representatives of the twelve tribes, inasmuch as at the dedication of the new temple they offer "a sin-offering for *all Israel according to the number of the twelve tribes*," Ezr. vi. 17. Those who returned with Ezra do the same thing. In thanksgiving for their happy return to their fatherland, they offer *twelve bullocks for all Israel*, ninety-six rams, seventy-seven lambs, and twelve he-goats for a sin-offering, all for a burnt-offering unto Jehovah, Ezr. viii. 35. Undoubtedly the overwhelming majority of those who returned with Zerubbabel and Ezra belonged to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, which is simply explained by the consideration, that these being a much shorter time in exile, had retained more faithfully the longing after the home given by the Lord to their fathers than the ten tribes who had been exiled 130 years. But that these also in the course of time, after those who returned to their ancient land had attained to greater ecclesiastical and civil prosperity, followed in great numbers, we must infer from this, that in the times of Christ and the apostles, Galilee and partly also Peraea were very densely peopled with Israelites; which population cannot be derived from the Jews who returned to Judaea under Zerubbabel and Ezra, because the Jews of Galilee were not regarded by those of Judæa as of equal birth, but more or less despised on account of their Galilæan origin. But those who remained in foreign countries were so intermingled afterwards with the Jews, who were scattered over all regions of the earth since the time of Alexander, and especially after the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth by the Romans, that the last traces of the old division of tribes have entirely disappeared.

mentioned in that which precedes. But according to Ezra iv. 2, Esarhaddon brought the heathen colonists into the country.[1] This statement it is sought indeed generally to reconcile with that presupposition by the assumption, that one part of the new colonists had been transplanted to Samaria by Shalmaneser, and another by Esarhaddon, whereby it is at the same time assumed, that Esarhaddon in this expedition removed the last remnant of the ten tribes, all who had escaped during Shalmaneser's invasion into the mountains or inaccessible retreats of the land, partly also no doubt into Judæa, and had assembled again into the land after the departure of the Assyrians (see Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 179.) But the following considerations are against this view; (*a.*) Our author does not compel us to understand Shalmaneser by the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר, inasmuch as the introduction of the colonists into the land is not so closely connected with the removal of the Israelites from it, that both must have been effected by one and the same Assyrian king. (*b.*) Of a twofold transplanting of colonists to Samaria no indication is any where found, and as little of a second removal of the part of Israel that remained after Shalmaneser. The prediction Is. vii. 8, that within sixty-five years Ephraim shall be broken that it be no more a people, if it refer according to the supposition of Ussher, Hengstenb. (Christol. i. 2, p. 56 f.) and others to the transplanting of heathen colonists to Samaria by Esarhaddon, by no means requires a removal of the last remnant of the Israelites by this king, but only the occupation of the country by heathen settlers, with whom the small remainder of the Ephraimites intermingled, so that Ephraim ceased to be a people. For so long as the land of Israel was only desolate and bereaved of the greatest part of its Israelitish population, the possibility remained that the exiles might return to their fatherland, and with those who remained

[1] Kalkar has inaccurately examined this passage, if he (in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. iii. 3, p. 25) asserts, "from Ezr. iv. 2 we see only, that the Samaritans worshipped Jehovah since the time of Esarhaddon, not at all, that he led a colony to Samaria;" for the passage runs literally thus, "for we, as ye, seek your God, but we do not sacrifice to him since the days of Esarhaddon the king of Assyria, *who brought us up hither.*" They could not, they say, sacrifice to him hitherto, because they had no temple of Jehovah, on which account they now wish to take part in the building of the temple.

behind form again a people, and so long might Israel be still regarded as a people, as the Jews in the Babylonish exile did not cease to be a people, because they had the certain hope of returning to their own land after a seventy years' banishment. But after heathen colonists were settled in the country, with whom the Israelites remaining in the land amalgamated, so that a Samaritan mixed population of a predominantly heathen character grew up, a people of Ephraim could no longer be spoken of in the land of Israel. This settlement of the colonists in the cities of Samaria might therefore be described as the time of the total dissolution of the people of Ephraim without the necessity of assuming at the same time a removal of the last remnant of the Israelites, of which *history* knows nothing. This must certainly be assumed, if the ten tribes were removed to the last man, and the Samaritans were a purely heathen people without any admixture of Israelitish blood, as Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179, ii. p. 3 ff.), wished to show: but the inadequacy of this demonstration has been convincingly proved by Kalkar (the Samaritans a mixed people, in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. iii. 3 p. 24 ff.) By the מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר accordingly we understand with Tremellius Esarhaddon, who transplanted the Samaritans according to their own account from Babylon, Cuthah, and other places, to Samaria, and are not afraid that the well-known mendacity of the Samaritans so strongly urged by Hengstenb. (Beitr. ii. p. 6 ff.) will be made good against this testimony, because the Samaritans, like all liars, only lied, when they hoped to gain some advantage by their lying. וַיָּבֵא, "and he brought," namely, men or settlers, from Babel, which was a province of the Assyrian empire, Cuthah, etc. The situation of Cuthah (כּוּתָה) cannot be determined with certainty. Josephus (Ant. ix. 14—3, and x. 9—7) explains it as a region of inner Persia, in which Zonaras, the Chron. Alex. and Cellarius agree with him; J. D. Mich. in the *spicil.* i. p. 104 f., as a district about Sidon, because the Samaritans, in a letter to Alexander the Great, say, that they were called Sidonians (comp. Jos. Ant. xi. 8—6, and vii. 5—5), but in the *Suppl. ad lex. Hebr.* p. 1255 f. he has rightly abandoned this opinion and decided rather for the كوثي كوثا, mentioned by Abulfeda and other Arabic and Persian writers in the Babylo-

nian Irak in the district of the Nahr Malcha, in which Rosenm. (Althk. i. 2, p. 29), and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 674) rightly agree with him, as this opinion has the greatest probability. Moreover, the greatest number of colonists must have come from Cutha, as the Samaritans are called כותיים by the Rabbins.—עַוָּא Avah is probably the same as עִוָּה Ivah (xviii. 34, xix. 13; Is. xxxiv. 13), as the conjecture forces itself on every one, that the Avites transplanted by Esarhaddon are those, whose kingdom was destroyed by the Assyrian kings (xviii. 34, xix. 13); but where the city or district Avah is to be sought is equally uncertain. Iken (*diss. phil. theol.* p. 152) compares the Phœnician city Avatha (comp. *Rel. Pal. ill.* p. 232 f.); and so Mich. (*Suppl.* p. 1851), because, according to v. 31, the Avites worshipped Nibhaz, by which idol he understands the great stone dog that stood formerly in the region between Berytus and Tripolis, and from which the Lycus received the name نهر كلب dog's river. This is very improbable, because the Assyrian policy could only hope to attain its end by transplanting the nations into distant, not contiguous localities. Ges. (on Is. i. p. 957) and Winer (R.W. i. p. 136) are of opinion that the city Avah is probably to be sought in Mesopotamia, but no trace of it remains either in the old writers or in the present oriental topography.[1] But might not Avah be identical with the city Awah or Abah (comp. Büsching's Magaz. v. p. 326), mentioned by Abulfeda in Persian Irak, lying twenty-seven parasangs north-east of Hamadan?—חֲמָת is the celebrated city Hamath on the Orontes, see above p. 134.—סְפַרְוַיִם Sepharvaim is probably the Σιπφάρα of Ptol. v. 18, the most southern city of Mesopotamia, perhaps the same as the πόλις Σιπαρηνῶν mentioned by Abydenus in *Eusebii. præp. ev.* ix. 41. Comp. Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1084 f., Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 152 f., Ges. *thes.* ii. 969, and Winer, R.W. ii. p.

[1] Hitzig in his comm. on Is. p. 425 explains עַוָּא as the earlier residence of the Nomade עַוִּים mentioned Deut. ii. 23, who dwelt before the Philistines unto Gaza, and seeks their home in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, as he supposes that these Avites migrated thence to Philistaea. But without any ground, as not a syllable is said in Deut. ii. 23 of an immigration of the עַוִּים.

526. On the other hand Vitringa and others sought the place in Syria, an assumption which is not demanded by its connexion with Hamath.—וַיֹּשֶׁב "and caused them to dwell in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel." From these words Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179) infers, that Esarhaddon removed the Israelites to the last man. But that these words must not be so strictly taken is evident from 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, according to which in Josiah's time a whole remnant of Israel (כָּל־שְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל) existed in the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, and even to Naphtali (2 Chr. xxxiv. 6), of whom the Levites had collected money for the repair of the temple. The words of our verse only prove, that the Israelites were henceforth no longer the principal inhabitants, the possessors of the land, but the colonists transplanted thither entered into their place as owners of the soil. But from this it no more follows, that an Israelite was not to be found in the land, than it follows, for example, from the words Jos. xi. 23, "So Joshua took the whole land according to all that Jehovah had said, and *Joshua gave it for an inheritance unto Israel,* according to their divisions by their tribes," that at that time all the Canaanites were extirpated, or at least driven out of their possessions.

Vv. 25—33. In the first period of their settlement in the cities of Samaria the new colonists were attacked by lions, wherein they recognized a judgment of the Deity of the land, whom they did not worship, and therefore petitioned the Assyrian king for an Israelitish priest, who might teach them the right worship of the God of the land. The king granted their request, and sent one of the exiled priests of Israel, who fixed his residence at Bethel, and instructed them in the worship of Jehovah.[1]

[1] Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 179, ii. p. 13) urges also the petition of the heathen colonists as one of the chief reasons proving that the last remnant of Israel had been removed by Esarhaddon, as he concludes from it, that "they have no one in the land who can give them the rudest idea of the way and manner of worshipping the God of the land." But here two things are overlooked, (a) the priests were not = Israelites, that, therefore, the removal of all the inhabitants, even the lowest and most unimportant class of the ten tribes, does not follow from the removal of *all* the priests; (b) that the petition speaks of sending a priest, and not at all of communicating "only the rudest idea of the way and manner of worshipping the God of the land," that,

—From the theocratic point of view (comp. Lev. xxvi. 22; Jer.

according to the religious views of the heathen, a local deity can only be worshipped in a right manner by the priests consecrated to him, that only the offerings presented by his priests are acceptable to him, and adapted to appease his anger and avert the plague from the land. If it be objected, on the other hand, that the new settlers, according to v. 32, made priests from the whole people, this took place only after the arrival of the Israelitish priest, who could consecrate other priests. What Hengstenb. has farther adduced (to conclude at once the point in question) has still less force. The prophetic expressions concerning the expulsion of the ten tribes from their land, Jer. iii., xxx., xxxi., and Zech. x., prove by no means the removal of the last remnant of the people of Israel, but only the rejection and banishment of the people as a whole. The circumstance, also, that the Samaritans, Ezr. iv. 1, do not assert their Israelitish origin, will not surprise any one, who knows, that they did not become Israelites, because the heathen transplanted to Samaria were incoprorated with the remnant of Israelites in the land into a mixed populace, in which the prevailing heathen blood and heathen disposition had long entirely extinguished the Israelitish element. The remaining arguments drawn from Jesus Sir. and from the New Testament, are devoid of all force, see the refutation by Kalkar i. p. q. p. 30 ff. On the contrary, in favour of the mixed origin of the Samaritans is in the first place the analogy of all other deportations, in which only the mass of the populace as a body, particularly those classes of the inhabitants, from whom new seditions were to be apprehended, was removed, not to speak of the impossibility of getting hold of all the inhabitants to the last man in any country, especially a mountainous one (comp. Kalk. p. 28). Add to this the historical testimonies of Chronicles concerning a remnant of Israelites after the removal of the people. Among these is first 2 Chr. xxx., where the invitation sent by Hezekiah "to the escaped, that remained from the hand of the king of Assyria" in the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even unto Zebulon, to partake of the passover at Jerusalem, is mentioned. As according to Hengstenberg's own assumption, as well as our remarks on xviii. 3, this event belongs to the period after the deportation by Shalmaneser, and the whole Old Testament knows nothing of a second deportation, it furnishes a decided proof of an Israelitish remnant in the land. If it be sought to invalidate this argument by the affirmation of a second deportation after Shalmaneser, though destitute of all historical ground, yet it is impossible to set aside the similar fact related 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, that under Josiah, at least fifty years after the settlement of the colonists in the cities of Samaria by Esarhaddon, the Levites collected money for the repair of the temple from Manasseh and Ephraim and the whole remnant of Israel. And this fact, in conjunction with the other undertaking of the same king, namely, to search the houses in the cities of Manasseh and Ephraim, and Simeon even unto Naphtali, and destroy the high places, Astartes and idols (2 Chr. xxxiv. 6 comp. with 2 Ki. xxiii. 15—20), affords the most striking proof that there was a remnant of

xv. 3), the author of our books explains the plague of lions as a punishment from God. There were certainly lions in Palestine before this (Judg. xiv. 5; 1 Sam. xvii. 34 f.; 2 Sam. xxiii. 10; 1 Ki. xiii. 24, xx. 36), especially in the northern mountains (Song iv. 8; Jer. v. 6), in the woods (Jer. xii. 8; Am. iii. 4), and in the brushwood on the banks of the Jordan (Jer. xlix. 19, l. 44; Zech. xi. 3), although travellers have met with none in recent times (comp. v. Raum. Pal. p. 104 and Win. R.W. ii. p. 37); but during the depopulation of the land from Shalmaneser to Esarhaddon they had encreased very much, so that they killed many of the settlers (וַיִּהְיוּ הֹרְגִים בָּהֶם they killed of them, namely, many.)—V. 26. מִשְׁפַּט אֱלֹהֵי הָאָרֶץ, "the right of the God of the land," that is, his right worship which he demands as due to him from the inhabitants; comp. on משפט on i. 7.—V. 27. וְיֵלְכוּ וְיֵשְׁבוּ *eant et habitent, sc. ipse et qui cum eo erunt, ejus socii, administri.* So correctly Maur., in opposition to Dathe and the exeg. Hdb., who would change the plural into the singular. The priest sent by Esarhaddon to the colonists was no Levitical priest of the Lord, but an Israelitish priest of the calves. This appears not only from the fact that he was one of the deported priests, and in Israel there were none but priests of the calves, but may also be inferred from the circumstance that he settled in Bethel, the chief seat of the calf-worship, and that his instruction in the fear of Jehovah had only the effect that the new inhabitants of the land, like Jeroboam I., made priests out of the whole people, and worshipped Jehovah in the high places built by the Israelites (1 Ki. xii. 31, xiii. 32), but at the same time adored each people its own gods according to the custom of the גּוֹיִם, that is, of the heathenishly disposed Israelites, who had been carried away thence (v. 32 f.) The שֹׁמְרֹנִים (v. 29) are not the colonists transplanted to Samaria, as some expositors think, but the earlier inhabitants of the kingdom of Israel (שֹׁמְרוֹן see above p. 209), *Israelitae dum illi adhuc ibi erant* (Jarchi); for the שמרנים are clearly distinguished from the colonists, who

Israelites in the land, even after the times of Esarhaddon, that was not removed, and that might and did mingle with the heathen settlers, as Ephraim and Manasseh belonged to the province of Samaria that was afterwards inhabited only by Samaritans.

made use of their high places. The words אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ הַשֹּׁמְרֹנִים are a parenthesis, and the following גּוֹי גּוֹי depend on יַנִּיחוּ. Hence it follows that the Israelitish high-places still remained on the removal of the people, as nothing is said of a destruction of the cities on the conquest of the land by the Assyrians. Too much, however, would be attributed to the words, if they were to be interpreted so strictly as to imply that all the high places remained standing, and the new settlers had only used those previously existing and built none in addition to them.—The various gods of the heathen settlers named in vv. 30 and 31 are all of Babylonian or Assyrian origin, and are almost wholly unknown. Pfeiffer (*dub. vex.* p. 450) and Carpzov. (*Appar.* p. 516 ff.) have enumerated the opinions of the older expositors, especially the Rabbins. The Babylonians made for themselves סֻכּוֹת בְּנוֹת *tents of daughters.* Selden (*de diis Syr.* ii. c. 7, p. 283 ff.), Voss (theol. Gentil. ii. 22), Münter (Rel. d. Bab. p. 74), Winer (R.W. ii. 629), and others understand by this, tents or booths in which, according to the custom mentioned by Herod. (i. 199) and Strabo (xvi. p. 745), the maidens exposed themselves in honour of the Babylonian Mylitta (called *καμάραι* by Herod.); but to this A. Beyer in the *Addit. ad Seld.* p. 310 ff. and Carpz. *l.c.* have fairly objected, that according to the plain words of our verse gods or objects of idolatrous worship are intended, which were placed in the בֵּית בָּמוֹת; comp. also Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 160. The Rabb. understand by it an idol, some the hen with her chickens, others the Pleiades or the constellation of the clucking hen (see Carpz. *l.c.*) On the contrary, Mov. (Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 596) renders סכות בנות *involucra* or *secreta mulierum,* and understands this of the idol of Mylitta, that is, the female organs of generation, which as symbols of the Babylonian goddess were kept in the sanctuaries wrapped up in robes woven for them (1 Ki. xxiii. 7) by the women or the young girls dedicated to her, who presented them as *Secreta Veneris* also to the paramours in return for the money given to Mylitta. But סכות בנות does not etymologically signify *secreta mulierum.* The סֻכּוֹת can only be *tabernacula (idolis sacra) in excelsis* (Ges. *thes.* ii. 952) or little tent-temples, which were regarded as holy and worshipped with the gods they

contained. This appears—altogether apart from the passage Amos v. 26, according to which the Israelites in their march through the wilderness bore סכּוּת their king—partly from xxiii. 7, according to which the women wove for the Asherah, which is of the same nature with the Babylonian Mylitta, בָּתִּים houses, little temples, partly from Ezek. xvi. 16, where the Israelites are thus reproached, thou didst take of thy garments and didst make for thee variegated בָּמוֹת, that is, idol-temples made of patch-work. The addition בְּנוֹת, if it stand for בָּנוֹת daughters, cannot certainly be understood with Hengstenb. i. p. q. p. 161 of the daughters of Bel and Mylitta, but is perhaps to be explained by this, that these little temples were dedicated pre-eminently to the daughters, inasmuch as Mylitta was especially honoured by these, namely, by the prostitution of their chastity.—The Cuthites made for themselves נֵרְגַל. Movers, p. 68, with the Rabbins imagines Nergal to be a cock; Selden (ii. *c.* 8) and Carpz. p. 517 explain the word *ignis perennis in septis a Cuthaeis religiosissime servatus*, after a quite uncertain etymology from נר = ניר and גל from גלא. The moderns take Nergal to be the planet Mars, inasmuch as Winer (R.W. ii. p. 175) after Norberg (*Onom. cod. Nasar.* p. 105 f.) connects נרגל with نيرن, in Arab. مرّيخ, *Mars hasta et flagello munitus*; Ges. (*thes.* ii. 913) now prefers explaining it with P. v. Bohlen from the Sanscr. nrigal, *homines devorans*, against which the only objection is that nri certainly means *virum*, *hominem*, but gal signifies not *devorare*, but *labi*, *decidere*, *fluere*, and is perhaps etymologically connected with quall, quellen (see Bopp, *glossar. sancr.* p. 103 of the second ed.), and the signification *comedere* in Westergaard (*radic. ling. sancr.* p. 249), rests on the mere identification of gal with gri.[1] The men of Hamath made for

[1] Movers takes נרגל to be an abbreviated form of נרגל שַׂרְאֶצֶר, a name borne by two Babylonian grandees in Jer. xxxix. 3, of whom the one was a president of the Magi, and therefore probably had his name from the god, whose chief priest he was; שראצר signifies fire-prince and נרגל is, like נריג, נרגא, the hatchet or axe, which the Assyrian Mars had assigned to him as fire-prince (d. Relig. d. Phön. i. p. 341 f. and 423.)

themselves אֲשִׁימָא. Ashima was worshipped, according to Rabb. statements, under the form of a bald he-goat (see Selden ii. c. 9, Carpz. p. 518.) All other conjectures are still more uncertain, comp. A. Beyer *Addit.* p. 319, f., Ges. *thes.* i. 161, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 112.—The Avites worshipped נִבְחַז and תַּרְתָּק. The Rabb. derive the name נבחז from נָבַח *latrare* and explain Nibhaz to be an idol in the form of a dog (Selden ii. 9; and *Addit.* p. 321, Carpz. p. 518), with which Iken (*dissert.* i. p. 143 ff.) then connected the colossal figure of a dog, which, according to the testimony of the traveller de la Roque, is found in Syria, three days' journey from Berytus towards Tripolis, and was worshipped by the inhabitants of that region as a tutelary god (see on v. 24.) Winer (R.W. ii. p. 178), and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 842, and comm. on Is. ii. p. 348), incline rather to the assumption, that נבחז is an evil demon, the ܢܒܙ of the Zabians, which Norberg, who first started this opinion, describes in the *Onom. cod. Nas.* p. 100, as *horrendus rex infernalis : posito ipsius throno ad telluris i.e. lucis et caliginis confinium, sed imo acherontis fundo pedibus substrato*, with which the similar description of the Cod. Ad. ii. 50, lin. 12, given in the same place is to be compared. Tartak, which, according to the Rabb., must have had the form of an ass, (comp. Seld. and Carpz. ll. cc.), Ges. (Comm. on Is. ii. p. 348), and Winer (R.W. ii. p. 703), have also taken for a *cacodaemon*, whereby we might perhaps understand a planet of ill omen, Saturn or Mars, as the word in Pehlvi signifies deep darkness.—The settlers from Sepharvaim burned their children to Adrammelech and Anammelech. The sacrifices of children made to these gods indicate their relationship with Molech. According to the Rabbins, Adrammelech must have had the form of a mule or peacock, Anammelech of a horse or pheasant (see Seld. and Carpz. *ll. cc.*); but most probably these deities were also of an astrological nature. The name אַדְרַמֶּלֶךְ, which occurs also xix. 37, as the name of a man, is explained either from the Shemitic אדר, (glorious king), or from the Pers. آذر اذر, (fire king), and understood of the sun. So Ges. Comm. on Is. ii. p. 347, after *Jurieu, hist. des cultes* iv. p. 653. Other conjectures of Lette see in the *Biblioth. Brem. nov. fasc.* i. No. 2.

עֲנַמֶּלֶךְ *Jurieu* would understand of the moon, but quite uncertainly. Hyde (*de relig. vett. Pers.* p. 131), explained the name much more probably of the constellation *Cepheus*, which in Oriental astronomy is called the shepherd, and the cattle (الراعي والغنم), and the herd-stars (كواكب الغرق), as ענם might correspond to the Arab. غنم = צאן. In his *thes.* ii. 1052, Ges. conjectures also, that ענם may be equal to صنم *statua*, and so signify *statua regis i.e. Molochi.* Finally Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 410), takes both names for one deity, a two-formed Molech, inasmuch as he asserts with right, that the *Kethibh* אלה ספרוים is to be read אל הספרוים the god of Sepharvaim, and explains this double god as a sun-god, because Sepharvaim, whose πολιοῦχος he was, is described by Berosus as a city of the sun. So far Movers is perhaps right, but his farther assumption is extremely precarious, that we "are to regard Adar-Melech as the sun-fire, and indeed, as Adar is Mars, in so far he was conceived to be a destructive power," and that Anammelech is a contraction of עין המלך *oculus Melechi*, signifying the ever watchful eye of Saturn, according to which Adrammelech is to be taken for the solar Mars, Anammelech for the solar Saturn.[1]

Vv. 34—41. This divine service compounded of the service of idols and of Jehovah the new inhabitants of the kingdom of the ten tribes retained unto this day, that is, till the time of the Babylonian exile, when our books were composed. In later times, as is known, the Samaritans abandoned idolatry and adopted

[1] Hitzig and Benfey have proposed still other but extremely doubtful explanations. Hitzig (Comm. on Is. p. 437), takes אדר to mean the month Adar, which originally denoted a deity, and ענמלך to be compounded of המלך and ען time = *Kronos*, according to which the two words coincide in meaning: "Adar the king, or Kronos the king," comp. on the contrary, Ges. *thes.* ii. 1052. Benfey (die Monatsnam. p. 187 f.) explains with Reland (diss. ii. 113), אדרמלך fire-king, and proposes to take ענמלך as an abbreviation of the Persian deity *Anahit*, or still better of the *Aniran* of Yezd, standing in the closest connexion with fire, in Zend *Anaghra* (lights) without beginning.

monotheism.[1]—V. 34. "They fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes or after their ordinances," that is, they have not purely retained either the worship of Jehovah or their former idolatry, but a compound of both. Naturally, therefore, they did not follow the law and commandments, which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, to whom he gave the name of Israel (Gen. xxxii. 29; 1 Ki. xviii. 31), and which required the sole worship of Jehovah with the exclusion of all other gods. On v. 35 f., comp. Ex. xx. 5, and the remarks on v. 7. בְּכֹחַ גָּדוֹל is found, Ex. xxxii. 11, and בִּזְרוֹעַ נְטוּיָה, Ex. vi. 6, xx. 33 f.; Deut. iv. 34, v. 15.—In the words אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב לָכֶם (v. 37) the written composition of the law through Moses is presupposed; for although the name of Moses is not mentioned, our author knows no other law than that given by Moses, comp. above p. 20 f.—V. 40. מִשְׁפָּטָם הָרִאשׁוֹן is the divine worship composed of idolatry and the external service of Jehovah, comp. v. 34.

[1] The reasons by which Hertz, i. p. q. p. 118 ff. wished to prove, that this section was written in the time of Josiah, and that the Samaritans had renounced idolatry at that time, and therefore before the Babylonian exile, are not cogent, as the words, v. 41, "they (these settlers) and their children, and their children's children (grand children) did as their fathers" must not be so strictly taken, that it could be inferred from them, that with the third generation, with the grandchildren, and therefore ninety years after the fall of the kingdom of Israel, the idolatry of the Samaritans ceased; altogether apart from the consideration, that this computation is antecedently false, because it supposes that Shalmaneser transplanted the new colonists to Samaria immediately after the removal of the Israelites. And from the fact that on petitioning to be allowed to take part in the building of the temple by Zerubbabel, they say to the Jews, "we seek your God, as ye," etc. (Ezr. iv. 2), it does not follow with certainty that they had at that time entirely renounced proper idolatry.

# THIRD SECTION.

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH FROM THE DISSOLUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY.

In this period, which embraces an interval of 134 years from the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, 722 B.C. to the burning of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, 588 B.C. (see above p. 187), the kingdom of Judah is at the very first sorely pressed by the Assyrian Sennacherib, but at the entreaty of the pious king Hezekiah is miraculously delivered from this powerful enemy, xviii.—xx.; though in the fifty-seven years of the ungodly reigns of the idolatrous Manasseh and his son Amon, it is made ripe for its fall, xxi., which even the god-fearing Josiah, notwithstanding all his endeavours to extirpate idolatry and restore the true worship of Jehovah could not avert, but only delay for a time, xxii.—xxiii. 28. After this pious king had fallen in the unfortunate battle with Pharaoh Necho, the country was occupied by the Egyptians, his son Jehoahaz, who was made king by the people, was carried into Egypt by Necho after a reign of three months, and his brother Eliakim under the name of Jehoiakim appointed king, xxiii. 29—36. Under Jehoiakim Nebuchadnezzar, after he had defeated the Egyptian army of Necho at the Euphrates, invaded Judea, and in three campaigns, the latter two of which were occasioned by the revolt of the Jewish kings who had become his tributaries, made an end of the kingdom of Judah by the removal of the people to Babel, and the repeated conquest and final destruction and burning of Jerusalem, xxiv. and xxv.

# CHAPTER XVIII.

## REIGN OF KING HEZEKIAH, V. 1—12. SENNACHERIB'S EXPEDITION AGAINST JUDAH AND JERUSALEM, V. 13—37.

V. 1—8. Beginning, duration, and spirit of the reign of Hezekiah. V. 1 f. "In the third year of Hoshea of Israel Hezekiah became king, and was twenty-five years old." As, according to vv. 9 and 10, the fourth and fifth years of Hezekiah correspond to the seventh and ninth of Hoshea, his first year appears to run parallel with the fourth of Hoshea. Josephus has, therefore (Ant. ix. 13—1), instead of the third year (v. 1) placed ἔτει τετάρτῳ, for which also Maur. has finally decided. But if we assume that the beginning of Hezekiah's reign falls in the end of Hoshea's third year, his fourth and sixth year must then coincide for the most part with the seventh and ninth of Hoshea, so that no change of the שָׁלֹשׁ in v. 1 is necessary. The age of Hezekiah at the commencement of his reign is surprising. For as his father Ahaz ascended the throne when twenty years old, and reigned only sixteen, if Hezekiah was twenty-five years old at his father's death, he must have been born in his eleventh year. This certainly implies a maturity in Ahaz earlier than is found in our northern climes.' Many interpreters, therefore, presuming an error in the numbers, have supposed either that Hezekiah was not twenty-five (כה) but only twenty (כ) years old at his accession (Cler., d. exeg. Hdb., and others), or that Ahaz in the commencement of his reign was twenty-five and not twenty years of age, as the LXX., Syr. and Arab. actually read twenty-five years in 2 Chr. xxviii. 1 (Win. R.W. i., p. 45.) Both suppositions are possible, for in the latter case Ahaz would only be born in the fifteenth year of his father Jotham's life, which is not at all improbable, and may be sufficiently justified by the actual occurrence of similar mistakes in the statement of numbers; but they are not absolutely necessary, as instances of so early maturity are not wanting in southern countries. Sam. Bochart, in his *Epistola ad N. Carbonelli*, has quoted from Hieronymus *(ep. ad Vitalem* 132) and an old *glossa*, the cases

of a boy of ten years, and of one of nine, *qui nutricem suam gravidavit*, and several similar instances from later writers (*geogr. sacr.* p. 920 ff. *ed Lugd.*) Thevenot also remarks in his travels (part iii. p. 165), that among the Indians are found fathers of ten and mothers of eight years of age, and even lately K. Koch knew a young princess in Mingrelia, who in her tenth year was married to an Abkhasian prince in his twelfth year (see travels through Russia to the Caucasian Isthmus, part ii. in the Widenmann and Hauffschen Samml. von Reisen, part 26, p. 194.) —V. 3 ff. Hezekiah walked in the footsteps of his ancestor David in earnest devotedness to the Lord, in all confidence in him and sincere obedience to his commandments, inasmuch as he had been turned to the Lord his God on the one hand perhaps by the calamities, which the untheocratic reign of his ungodly father had brought on the kingdom, and on the other by the powerful influence of the prophet Isaiah. He therefore, in the very first year of his reign, reopened and purified the temple that had been defiled by the idolatrous practices of Ahaz and at length entirely closed, made atonement for the sins of the whole people by a sin-offering, and by a great burnt-offering renewed the worship of God in the temple, but afterwards summoned also the whole people, not merely his own subjects, but also the remnant that was left of the tribes of Israel, to a grand passover festival at Jerusalem in order to rekindle their love to the worship of the Lord, and finally destroyed all the monuments of idolatry in the whole land, and even to Ephraim and Manasseh, while he provided the temple-worship with the means necessary for its due administration, and arranged it throughout according to the law. All this is related at large in 2 Chr. xxix. 3—xxxi. 19, while our author contents himself with mentioning in a few words the extirpation of idolatry and the faithful observance of the law of Moses on the part of this king.[1]

[1] The attacks of De Wette (Beitr. i. p. 115) and Gramberg (die Glaubw. d. Chron. p. 185 ff.) on the credibility of these accounts of Chronicles, to which even Winer (R.W. i. p. 585) assented, have been already shown to be unfounded by Dahler (*de libr. Paral.* p. 131), von Hertz (i. p. q. p. 148 ff.), and in my apol. Vers. p. 399, while Winer has paid no attention to these replications. What Chronicles relates in detail of Hezekiah's efforts to restore and revive the worship of Jehovah, is only the historical enlargement of the brief and general

V. 4. On the מַצֵּבֹת ,בָּמוֹת, and אֲשֵׁרָה, see above, p. 220 ff. אשׁרה is here obviously to be taken *collective*, as has been al-

statement of our author, that this king uniformly adhered to the Lord and kept his commandments given by Moses; for Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1 p. 22) very fairly remarks, "to the abrogated heathen worship, something positive, a purely theocratic worship, must be opposed." Yet the allusions of the prophet Isaiah xx. 30, and xxxi. 5, to which Häv. refers, I cannot recognise as proofs, partly because they do not point clearly enough to the great passover under Hezekiah mentioned in Chronicles, partly because they are not to be referred to this event, inasmuch as this prophecy of Isaiah was delivered before the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 139), while the solemn passover set on foot by Hezekiah was manifestly held after it. This follows clearly from the invitation to this festival sent to the residue of the ten tribes, in which, among other things, it is said, "ye children of Israel, turn to Jehovah, that he may turn to *you that are escaped, who remain from the hand of the king of Assyria;* and be not ye like your fathers and your brethren, who trespassed against Jehovah the God of your fathers, on which account he gave them up to desolation, as ye see; and be ye not stiffnecked, as your fathers, give the hand to Jehovah and enter into his sanctuary, which he hath sanctified for ever, and serve Jehovah your God, *that his kindled wrath may turn away from you; for if ye turn to Jehovah, your brethren and your children will find compassion before their conquerors, that they may return to this land,*" etc. (2 Chr. xxx. 6—9.) In these words the deportation of the greater part of the ten tribes is so plainly implied, that we cannot refer them to the deportation by Tiglath Pileser, which extended only to the transjordanic tribes and the Naphtalites, but not to Ephraim, Manasseh, and Zebulon, to whom the messengers of Hezekiah were sent with a letter of *this import.* On a cursory reading of 2 Chr. xxix.—xxxi. it might appear as if this passover were celebrated in the very first year of Hezekiah's reign, and for this reason, indeed, contrary to the law in the second month, because the first month was occupied with the necessary preparations (2 Chr. xxx. 2 f.) But this appearance vanishes on a closer inspection of these chapters. According to xxix. 3 Hezekiah in the first year of his reign, in the first month, opened the doors of the house of God and repaired them, then assembled the priests and Levites in order to charge them with the purification of the temple; whereupon they commenced the purification on the first day of the first month, and on the sixteenth day of the same month competed it (v. 17.) This purification begun on the first day of the first month cannot have taken place in the first, but at the earliest in the second year of Hezekiah's reign, because it was preceded by the repairing of the doors and the assembling and commissioning of the priests and Levites. After the purification was accomplished, the king, with the rulers of the city, offered a solemn sacrifice for the reconsecration of the temple, whereupon the congregation also presented burnt-offerings, and thus the service of the house of God was re-established. But the passover men-

ready remarked, p. 225 note. All the old versions have the plural, which 20 *codd.* in Kennicott also give. "And brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto these days the children of Israel had burnt incense to it, and it was called Nehushtan." This brazen serpent Moses had set up in the wilderness at the command of God as a symbol of the subduing and conquering of the serpents and their fatal bite, by which the people were visited (Num. xxi. 5—10, comp. Hav. Einl. i. 2 p. 502 f.) In after times the people inclined to superstition made this symbol an object of idolatrous veneration. For as Cleric. very truly remarks: *non est credibile a temporibus usque Mosis sine ulla intermissione cultum fuisse aenei serpentis simulacrum. Non videtur hoc passurus fuisse David uti nec Salomo primis regni sui annis. Sed potuerunt esse homines superstitiosi, qui interdum ad illud simulacrum suffitum adoleverint, quasi in honorem veri Dei,*

tioned after this in ch. xxx. must again have fallen in one of the following years. For if it had been intended to hold it in the second year of Hezekiah, after the purification and dedication of the temple was accomplished when the middle of the first month of this year was past, it could only have been stated as a reason for deferring the passover till the second month, "for the fourteenth day of the first month was already past," but not "for they could not keep it at that time (that is, in the first month appointed by law), because the priests had not sanctified themselves in sufficient time, neither had the people gathered themselves together to Jerusalem" (v. 3.) To this it is added that the assembling of the people, "from Beersheba even to Dan," could not be accomplished in two or three weeks, so that, if it had been designed to celebrate the passover in the same year, it would have been necessary to defer it not to the second but to a later month of the year. Hence it appears at least that the passover festival could not have taken place before the third year of Hezekiah. But in the fourth year Shalmaneser commenced warlike operations against the land of Israel, which continued for three years, during which a passover feast, to which the remnant of the ten tribes should be invited, is not to be thought of. Now if we add to what has been previously said, that the already noticed striking prominence given to the visitation brought upon the Israelites by the Assyrians in Hezekiah's letter of invitation implies, that the judgment of God that had come upon them was still fresh in the memories of those who had escaped it (which could not possibly be said of the deportation of the Gileadites and Naphtalites, twelve to fifteen years before, inasmuch as the tribes who had not felt the arms of Tiglath Pileser had unquestionably long since ceased to mourn over it), this passover festival cannot have occurred before, but must have taken place immediately after the fall of the kingdom of the ten tribes, which appears also to be indicated in 2 Chr. xxxii 1.

*qui jusserat Mosem id conflare; dein aucta etiam ut fit superstitione coluerint aut Deum Israelis sub ea imagine, aut quod deterius erat, peregrinum numen animo ei substituerint, atque simulacrum ejus Dei serpentem aeneum habuerint.* This abuse was the more natural, as among the heathen, particularly the Egyptians and Phenicians, serpents were adored as the bearers of a healing virtue and of immortality; comp. Cler. on the passage and Creuzer, Symbol. i. p. 526 ff. of the 2nd ed. נְחֻשְׁתָּן formed from נְחֹשֶׁת brass signifies something brazen. Most of the older expositors think the name has the accessory idea of contempt. But this neither lies in the form nor is it probable in itself, because it must otherwise have been applied to the brazen serpent only at and after its destruction; comp. *Pfeiff. dub. vex.* p. 452.—V. 5. "And after him was not his like among all the kings of Judah, or among those that were before him." From the first of these expressions J. D. Mich. concluded that the author of our books took it from his source, which, according to 2 Chr. xxxii. 32, came from the hand of Isaiah, as king Josiah came to the sovereignty fifty-six years after Hezekiah, and was not inferior to him in piety and sincere obedience to the law (comp. xxii. 2.) But this conclusion is by no means certain, inasmuch as Josiah's conduct is described in the same terms in xxiii. 25, whence we perceive that this expression was of a proverbial nature *de eo quod rarissimum et cujus nulla memoria est,* comp. Cler. on Ex. x. 14.—V. 6. וַיִּדְבַּק בַּיהוָה comp. p. 165. V. 7. הִשְׂכִּיל wise acting, including its happy consequences, see above p. 21. "And he was rebellious against the king of Assyria, and was not (any more) subject to him." Judah was brought into dependence on Assyria by Ahaz, which Hezekiah resisted obviously only after the withdrawal of Shalmaneser from Palestine, perhaps only after his death, for which reason Sennacherib made war upon him in order to reduce Judah under his sway (v. 13 ff.) V. 8. "He smote the Philistines unto Gaza and its borders," etc., he thus punished them for their invasion of Judah under Ahaz, took from them the cities then conquered (2 Chr. xxviii. 18), and reduced them to their old boundary, Gaza. This statement, therefore, confirms the account of Chronicles, which has been assailed by neological criticism, which is besides proved

to be true by Is. xiv. 28—32, comp. our note on xvi. 16, and Hävern. Einl. ii. 1, p. 220, also Movers' Krit. Unters. p. 128, where, moreover, the following words, "from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city," are erroneously explained of the cities founded by Uzziah in the territory of the Philistines, and the towers built for the protection of his flocks in the wilderness (2 Chr. xxvi. 6, 10), whereas this proverbial expression (comp. on xvii. 9) only affirms that Hezekiah smote all the stations of the Philistines from the smallest to the greatest and strongest.

In vv. 9—12 the destruction of the kingdom of Israel by Shalmaneser already narrated, xvii. 3—6, according to the annals of Israel, is repeated from the annals of the kingdom of Judah, in which it was also registered as an event of the highest importance for the theocracy.

From v. 13 to ch. xix. 37 follows the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah and his defeat, which is found almost word for word also in our collection of the prophecies of Isaiah, xxxvi. and xxxvii., and in a brief abstract, but notwithstanding its brevity furnishing several important supplements, in 2 Chr. xxxiii. These three accounts are independently of each other composed from the collection of the prophecies of Isaiah (2 Chr. xxxii. 32), which was embodied in the annals of the kingdom, as I have proved against Gesenius in my apol. Vers. p. 223—235, and as is now acknowledged by most critics and interpreters; comp. Ewald in the Leipziger A.L.Z. 1833 August, No. 188, p. 1502, Movers, Krit. Unters. p. 187, Hitzig, Umbreit, and Knobel on Is. xxxvi. and Hävern. Einl. ii. 3 p. 147 ff.

V. 13. Comp. Is. xxxvi. 1. "In the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, (714 B.C.), Sennacherib king of Assyria came up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them." This verse forms the introduction to the following narrative, in which the occupation of the whole land by the Assyrians is summarily stated, wherein "all the fenced cities" is not to be taken in the strictest sense, as besides the strong capital Jerusalem, the fortresses of Lachish and Libnah (v. 17 and xix. 8) were not yet conquered, when the following negotiations with Hezekiah were opened. Sennacherib (סַנְחֵרִיב, in the LXX. *Σενναχηρίβ* or *Σενναχηρίμ*, in Joseph. *Σεναχήριβος*) mentioned also by Berosus

in *Josephi. Ant.* x. 1—4, and in *Euseb. Chron. arm.* p. 18 f., by Abydenus (in Eus. Chr. arm. p. 23), and by Herodotus ii. 141, the successor of Shalmaneser (see on xv. 19) reigned according to Berosus eighteen years in the time of Hezekiah, comp. still on xix. 37. The name סנחריב corresponds probably to the Sanscrit Senâgrib and the new Persian سني كريب *exercituum victor.* So according to P. v Bohlen, Ges. *thes.* ii. 962; otherwise Win., *lex. s.v.*, Hitzig and Ges. himself on Is. xxxvi. 1. Herodotus (*l.c.*) calls him βασιλεὺς Ἀραβίων τε καὶ Ἀσσυρίων,[1] and says that his expedition was directed against Egypt, which also appears from xix. 24, is confirmed by Is. x. 24, and is besides easily reconciled with our narrative, as Judah formed the key to the conquest of Egypt for the Assyrian, as for all upper Asiatic conquerors, and had perhaps formally allied itself to Egypt, when Tirhakah marched against Sennacherib (xix. 9.)

V. 14—16. On the intelligence of Sennacherib's invasion Hezekiah at first made preparations for defence. He caused Jerusalem to be still more strongly fortified in case of a siege, and the fountains of the upper Gihon as well as the brook beside the city to be stopped (see on v. 17), in order to cut off the water from the besiegers, as is related in 2 Chr. xxxii. 2—8, and confirmed in the clearest manner by Is. xxii. 8—11, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 324, Häv. Einl. ii. 1, p. 221, and the expositors on Is. xxii. Meanwhile Sennacherib had penetrated to Lachish, whereupon Hezekiah, doubting the possibility of being able to resist his arms, sends messengers thither to treat with him concerning his submission, and actually sends the tribute demanded by Sennacherib, as is related in our verses. The fortress of Lachish lay seven Roman miles south of Eleutheropolis (see on xiv. 19), and therefore south west of Jerusalem on the way to Egypt. From the words of Hezekiah, "I have sinned, depart from me," etc., the older expositors infer, that Hezekiah sinned in his revolt from the Assyrian supremacy by refusing the farther payment of tribute; but as his predecessor Tiglath Pileser had

[1] This statement is explained perhaps in the simplest manner by the circumstance, that Arabia, taken in a wider sense, denotes all the provinces on this side of the Tigris, which the Assyrians governed in addition to their original country Assyria. Comp. Bochart *Phal.* i., c. 7, p. 31, and Schroeer *imper. Babyl.* p. 166.

brought the kingdom of Judah into dependence on himself only by dealing treacherously with Ahaz, the attempt of Hezekiah to shake off this yoke was scarcely to be blamed from a theocratic point of view. But Hezekiah certainly acted wrong in this respect, that after he had taken the first step he shrunk from its perilous consequences, and wished to purchase again the peace, which he himself had broken by new submission and payment of tribute. This false step of the pious king, arising from a momentary weakness of faith, was however turned into a blessing for him and his kingdom through the arrogance of Sennacherib and the covenant-faithfulness of the Lord.—V. 15 f. In order to make up the demanded tribute of 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold, as the treasures of the temple and the palace, having been very much exhausted under the bad government of Ahaz, did not suffice, Hezekiah was obliged to take the gold plating, with which he himself had overlaid the doors and posts of the temple (2 Chr. xxix. 3) and send it to the king of Assyria.[1] The substantive אֹמְנוֹת occurring only here etymologically *res sufficientes* denotes the door posts (סִקּוּפַיָּא, ܐܣܩܘܦܬܐ, اسكفات, *limina, superliminaria*, LXX., τὰ ἐστηριγμένα.)

V. 17. Not content with this payment of tribute, Sennacherib sent a strong body of troops under the command of Tartan, Rabsaris, and Rab-shakeh, from Lachish to Jerusalem, which posted itself on the west side of the city. In the text of Isaiah Rab-shakeh only is named, because he acted as spokesman in the following conference (see v. 19.) Tartan had probably the supreme command, as he is named first here, and, according to Is. xx. 1, also conducted the siege of Ashdod. Comp. the note on xv. 19. The name תַּרְתָּן, which, if we may conjecture from the other two names, is only a name of office or title, Gesen. and Hitzig on Is. xx. 1 explain by high person or crown of the body تارتن.—רַב־סָרִיס properly *princeps eunuchorum* (Ges. *thes.* ii. 973) and רַבְשָׁקֵה ܪܒ ܫܩܐ the chief cup-bearer are

[1] Οὐκ ἀπέχρων οἱ βασιλικοὶ θησαυροί· ἔθος οὖν ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀνάγκαις, καὶ τοὺς ἱερους θησαυροὺς δαπανᾷν καὶ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων ἀναπληροῦν. ἡ ἀνάγκη δὲ παρεσκεύασε καὶ τὰς πύλάς χωνεῦσαι τὰς χρυσᾶς, ἃς οὗτος κατεσκεύασε καὶ τοὺς σταθμοὺς τῶν θυρῶν. Theodoret.

names of office. There is therefore no ground for taking Rab-shakeh with Theod. and Procop. for a Hebrew, who had either of his own accord gone over to the Assyrians, or had been carried thither with the captives. The supreme court officers at the same time filled the office of generals in the army. The following words וַיָּבֹאוּ . . . וַיַּעֲלוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ are wanting in Isaiah, because they are unnecessary for the sense.—"The conduit of the upper pool by the highway of the fuller's field" (Is. vii. 3), is the conduit which went from the reservoir of the upper Gihon (Birket el Mamilla) to the lower pool, the Birket es Sultan (see above p. 11); as the end of this conduit is mentioned Is. vii. 3, which we cannot understand with Hitzig (Is. p. 75) of the end of the canal, which conducted the fountain to the pool, but only with Knobel (Is. p. 46) of the end of the conduit leading from the pool to the city. According to chap. xx. 20 and 2 Chr. xxxii. 30, Hezekiah stopped the upper mouth of the water of Gihon, and conducted it down from the west to the city, that is, he covered the conduit going from the upper Gihon to the lower pool, and so conducted the water, which formerly ran on the west side without the city walls down into the valley of Ben-hinnom, through a canal with several subterranean chambers into the city, whereby in case of a siege the water would be withdrawn from the enemy and preserved for the inhabitants of the city. This work, which is mentioned also by Jes. Sir. 48, 17, Hezekiah executed, but not, as Knob. p. 154 thinks, only after the departure of the Assyrians, but on their entrance into the country, before they appeared at Jerusalem, when he made the preparations for defence mentioned above in v. 14, to which belonged, according to 2 Chr. xxxii. 3 f., the stopping of the water fountains and of the brook by the city, and, according to Is. xxii. 11, the construction of a reservoir between the two walls for the water of the old pool, that is, the upper Gihon; against which the circumstance, that this work is mentioned in 2 Ki. xx. 20, 2 Chr. xxxii. 30, only at the end of Hezekiah's reign in the summary view of his celebrated deeds, proves nothing.[1]

[1] Comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 164 f., where reference is made to a similar precaution, which, according to Wilh. Tyr. viii. 7, the Mohammedans took on the first advance of the crusaders towards Jerusalem.

"The highway of the fuller's field" (Is. vii. 3), is the highway which either passed by the fuller's field or led to it. The first assumption is more probable, because the fuller's field, where the fullers, needing so much water for their business, cleansed and dried the cloths and stuffs, must have been in the neighbourhood of the upper pool, where a district had been assigned to them without the city, as the Roman fullers pursued their handicraft together without the city (comp. Martial. iv. 93, and Plaut. Asin. v. 2, 57) on account of the unpleasant smell (see Win. R.W. ii. p. 784.)

Vv. 18—25. (Is. v. 3—10.) Arrived at Jerusalem the Assyrian generals called for king Hezekiah to demand of him the surrender of the capital; but Hezekiah does not appear himself, but sends out his three chief ministers before the city walls, to whom Rab-shakeh addresses a boastful speech in order to intimidate Hezekiah and induce him to surrender. That they invite the king himself to the conference is omitted in the text of Isaiah. Eliakim the son of Hilkiah was only lately raised in Shebna's place, to be master of the house or minister of the royal court (עַל־הַבַּיִת comp. above p. 44), and in this office a father of his people (Is. xxii. 20 ff.) Comp. also on this office Paulsen d. Reg. d. Morgenl. p. 321.—Shebna (שֶׁבְנָה or שֶׁבְנָא in Is.) was formerly over the household, but was lately removed from this office on account of misconduct, as the prophet had announced to him (Is. xx. 15 ff.), though at the time still סֹפֵר secretary of the king or secretary of state (called among the Persians دوِاتدار *Devattar*, properly ink-horn bearer, among the Turks *Reis el Kutteb*, head of the scribes; see Paulsen p. 292 and v. Hammer, Staatsverf. des Osman. Reichs. ii. p. 109, and on this office among the Hebrews our remarks in p. 43), whereas Isaiah had predicted to him banishment to a distant land.[1] Joah, the son

[1] As the name of Shebna's father is not given either here or in Is. xxii. 15, the expositors of Isaiah have not unfairly concluded that he was a *novus homo*, an upstart, who abused his high station of chief steward of the royal household for the enrichment of his house, drove in a splendid chariot, and wished to establish a name and memory for himself by the preparation of a highly finished family sepulchre (Is. xxii. 16), and was therefore dismissed from his office. On the other hand, the farther conjecture of Hitzig is altogether precarious, that he

of Asaph, was recorder, who kept the דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים (see above p. 43.)—V. 19 ff. Rab-shakeh endeavours, in his address, to show that Hezekiah's confidence in his ability to resist the power of the Assyrians is vain, inasmuch as neither Egypt (v. 21) nor his God (v. 22) nor his military resources can protect him (v. 23.) The title of the great king, or king of kings (Ezek. xxvi. 7; Dan. ii. 36) was assumed by the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and other Oriental sovereigns, because not only many of their deputy governors of provinces bore the title of king, but also kings of conquered countries were under their supremacy as vassals, comp. Ges. Comm. on Is. i. p. 392. "What is this confidence that thou cherishest," that is, thy confidence that thou hast is a vain one. V. 20. אָמַרְתָּ is by general admission the original reading, and אָמַרְתִּי (Is. v. 5) a less suitable alteration.—"Thou sayest—only a word of the lips is counsel and strength for the war," that is, thou sayest, thou hast counsel and strength for the war, but this is only a vain pretence. So correctly Aben Ezra in *L. de Dieu ad h. l.* דְּבַר שְׂפָתַיִם is a word that comes only from the lips, not from the heart (לֵב), the seat of the understanding, and therefore an inconsiderate foolish speech (Prov. xiv. 23, comp. also Job xi. 2.) V. 21. "Egypt is a bruised reed, which, if a man lean on it, goes into the hand and pierces it." This figure is very significant of Egypt, inasmuch as the reed is there properly at home. Ezek. xxix. 6, 7, has borrowed this figure from our verse. קָנֶה רָצוּץ is not a broken, but only a bruised, crushed reed, which a man may take to be whole and so deceive himself, comp. Is. xlii. 3, where רָצַץ is opposed to שָׁבַר. What Rab-shakeh, arrogantly confiding in the invincible might of his master, here says of the vanity and ruinousness of trusting in Egypt, was literally true, and had already been very plainly stated by Isaiah (xxx. 3—5) to his people. The ו in וּבָא introduces the consequence.—V. 22. But besides Egypt, Judah had a strong shield of confidence, namely, the omnipotence of his God. This rock, also, which deceives no one who only

was perhaps a discontented Syrian, who had come from his country, which was subject to the Assyrians, to Jerusalem, and there counteracted the Assyrian interest.

puts his entire trust in it, Rab-shakeh wishes to shake, inasmuch as he artfully represents the reformation of religion effected by Hezekiah, and the destruction of the altars of high places, as an insult to the God of Israel. The Assyrians had thus heard of Hezekiah's reforms, and, according to their polytheistic notions, discovered therein an injury to the worship of God, which Rab-shakeh turns to his own ends in order to make the people waver in their confidence in the Lord. "If ye say, We trust in Jehovah our God (then I say) is not this he, that is, is not this the God, whose altars," etc.[1] V. 23 f. The last ground of Hezekiah's confidence appears to Rab-shakeh so insignificant and contemptible, that he offers him 2000 horses, if Hezekiah can only put riders on them. Here Gesen. fairly remarks, that the meaning is not that Hezekiah will not raise 2000 men, but 2000 men who could serve as horsemen. The Jews at that time had certainly cavalry, and attached much importance to them (Is. ii. 7, xxx. 16), but they could never be compared with the numerous cavalry of the Assyrian and Egyptian armies. הִתְעָרֵב to engage with any one, and hence here, "to enter into a contest" (Cler. and Gusset.) פַּחַת אַחַד וגו' "one captain of the least of my master's servants," that is, one of the least captains of my master. פחה signifies in itself a deputy or lieutenant, usually the deputy governor of a province under the Satrap, but at the sametime, in military states a lieutenant-general of the army. The פחות are thus עֲבָדִים קְטַנִּים. The interposition of אחד between the *nom. regens* in the *stat. constr.* and the noun depending on it is without a precedent, as by rule "no adjective, pronoun, or other word can come between the restricted

[1] The plur. תֹאמְרוּן, by which these words are addressed to the people, appears at first sight preferable, but is in fact only an alteration of the original reading תֹאמַר preserved in Isaiah, if thou sayest, namely, the king addressed in the person of his ambassadors, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 229. Farther, the assertion of Gesen. is false, that the author of Chronicles has quite mistaken the construction of our verse, inasmuch as this speech is repeated 2 Chr. xxxii. 12 in a contracted form, not verbally but according to the sense. Lastly, the inference of Knobel from the clause, "ye say to me," as to a previous conference of the delegates with Rab-shakeh, is also false.

and the restricting noun" (Ew. Gr. § 509), but we must conceive אחר as co-ordinate with, not subordinate to פַּחַת (Hitz.) V. 25. After Rab-shakeh thinks he has undermined every ground of Hezekiah's confidence, he comes to say also of his master, that he has not come against Jerusalem without Jehovah, but much rather by his commission. Rab-shakeh might have heard something of Isaiah's predictions of the sentence that was to be executed on Judah by the Assyrians, which turning to his purpose he so represents, as if his master had undertaken the campaign at the command of Jehovah. עַל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת (Is. v. 10) instead of עַל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה in our text owes its origin only to the tendency to assimilate the first sentence to the following one. המקום הזה is Jerusalem.

Vv. 26—28. (Is. v. 11—13.) The delegates of Hezekiah fear the boasting of Rab-shakeh might make some impression on the people, who were listening on the city walls: they therefore interrupt him, and request him to speak with them in Aramaic, as they understand that language; but Rab-shakeh replies, that his master had much rather commissioned him to address his speech to the people, and begins immediately in a still louder voice to urge the people to revolt from their king, and come over to the king of Assyria (v. 29 ff.) From these verses it appears that the Assyrian commanders understood Jewish or Hebrew, and the Jewish nobles on the other hand Aramaic. The mother tongue of Assyria was certainly not Aramaic, but a Medo-Persian dialect; but in all the parts of the Assyrian monarchy on this side of the Euphrates, in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, the Aramaic was the language of the country, which must therefore have been known also to the Assyrian government officers, and spoken also at court, if it was not actually the court language. יְהוּדִית signifies the native speech of the kingdom of Judah, and by no means implies a long interval after the captivity of the ten tribes, as Gesen. asserts. The change of the preposition הַעַל אֲדֹנֶיךָ וְאֵלֶיךָ (v. 27) is removed in Is. (v. 12); the suffix in אֵלֶיךָ refers to Eliakim, the spokesman of the Jewish delegates. The עַל is also not exactly equivalent to אֶל, but includes the idea partly of elevation above the others, partly of hostility. By the words, " who sit on the walls to eat

their own excrement, and drink their own urine," Rab-shakeh describes the inhabitants as determined to endure a hard siege with an intimation of its horrors, comp. vi. 25. For חֲרֵיהֶם = חֲרָאֵיהֶם *excrementa sua* and שֵׁינֵיהֶם *urinas suas* the Masor. have substituted the euphemisms צוֹאָתָם and מֵימֵי רַגְלֵיהֶם. V. 28. וַיַּעֲמֹד does not stand according to later speech usage for וַיָּקָם (Gesen., Hitz., and others); ויקם would here be quite unsuitable, because Rab-shakeh did not now for the first time stand up to speak, but was already standing, and had spoken; ויעמד means, he set himself, took a position designed for proper effect.

Vv. 29—33. (Is. 14—20). The address of Rab-shakeh to the people turns again on the thought, that Hezekiah can no more than his God defend Jerusalem from the power of the Assyrians; the people therefore should not allow themselves to be deceived by a vain confidence in him, but rather surrender immediately to the great king of Assyria, that they may enjoy a happy life under his sceptre. אַל־יַשִּׁיא, "let not Hezekiah deceive you," namely by the pretence, that he can defend the city against the assault of the Assyrians. The extraordinary phrase מִיָּדוֹ "out of his (the Assyrian's) hand," by which the speaker slips out of the speech begun in the name of his master, is omitted in Is. v. 14. V. 30. Concerning the use of אֶת with a passive see on vi. 5, and Ew. Gr. § 494 and 572. It is omitted in Is. v. 15. V. 31. עֲשׂוּ אִתִּי בְרָכָה, "make peace with me." ברכה blessing, happiness, is here according to later usage = the Chald. שְׁלָמָא peace; a signification, which is developed from the form of benediction שָׁלוֹם לָךְ. צְאוּ אֵלַי "come out to me," namely, from your walls, that is, surrender to me, comp. Ges. on Is. xxxvi. 16, where this phrase is supported by several passages from Bar Hebr. "To eat his own vine and his own fig-tree, and drink the water of his own well," means, to enjoy the fruits of his own property in rest and peace, comp. the analogous description of a life of undisturbed happiness, 1 Ki. v. 5 above, p. 57. The imperatives וְאִכְלוּ וּשְׁתוּ denote the consequence flowing of itself from that which precedes, com. Ew. Gr. § 618, "so will ye eat and drink." V. 32. "Till I come and take you," etc. In case of surrender also the Assyrian wishes to make use of his usual

policy of deportation into other countries. Comp. the examples, collected by Hengstenb. *de rebus Tyrior.* p. 51 f., of this measure, which was so often brought into operation in ancient times. But in order to reconcile the people to it, the boaster promises that Sennacherib will give them a land as good as their own. The description of this land (v. 32), which is abridged in Is. v. 17, as a land of corn and wine, bread and vineyards, olive trees and honey, is copied after the description of Canaan (Deut. viii. 8, xxxiii. 28), but not so as to presuppose a knowledge of these passages. Moreover, it is a vain labour, if the expositors (Hitz. Knob.) wished to discover the land according to this description, as Rab-shakeh in his boasting scarcely thought himself of any definite province of the Assyrian empire.—V. 33 ff. After representing to the people the delightfulness of the deportation, he returns to his principal argument, that even Jehovah cannot deliver Jerusalem from the Assyrian arms, as so many other gods had failed to deliver their countries. The regions enumerated, v. 34, occurred already, xvii. 24, as far as אַרְפָּד and הֵנַע, which, however, cannot be determined with certainty. Arpad (in Syr. ܐܪܦܕ) appears to have been a Syrian town, because it is always mentioned in conjunction with Hamath (xix. 13; Is. x. 9, xxxvi. 19, xxxvii. 13; Jer. xlix. 23), but cannot be farther indicated. Winer R.W. i. p. 103 has enumerated the altogether uncertain conjectures concerning it. Most after Büsching (see Ges. *thes.* i, 387), take Hena for the city عانة, mentioned by Abulf., on a ford of the Euphrates; comp. *Abulf. Mesop.* in Paulus' neu. Repert. iii. p. 33, and Assemanni *bibl. or.* iii. 2, p. 717.—Hitzig (on Is. p. 425) explains it by *lowland* from هنع *inflexit se, demisit* = كنب, connects it with Canaan, and understands by it a region of the Persian gulf, from which, according to Herodotus, the Phenicians emigrated. Obviously false, as هنع to bow, be bent, crooked, stands in no logical connection with lowland. Comp. with this our remarks on the herewith connected explanation given by Hitzig of עִוָּה on xvii. 31.[1]

[1] The names הֵנַע וְעִוָּה are wanting here in the text of Isaiah for the same reason for which this text has been several times abridged they are here as genuine and essential to the completeness of the discourse as in xix. 13.

—V. 34. The words כִּי הִצִּילוּ, "that they had delivered," for which וְכִי הִצִּילוּ stand in Is. v. 19, depend on אֱלֹהֵי הַגּוֹיִם, inasmuch as the God of Samaria also is included under these.

Vv. 36, 37. The people kept silence at this speech, because Hezekiah had forbidden any answer, obviously in order not to irritate the enemy any more, or to provoke them to the immediate storming of Jerusalem; and the delegates returned with their clothes rent in token of their grief on account of the speech of Rab-shakeh which reviled not only their king, but at the same time and still more Jehovah to Hezekiah, reporting to him the substance of the speech. The עָם (v. 36) is quite in its place, inasmuch as the speech was addressed not merely to the king's advisers, but to the whole assembled people. Its omission in Is. v. 21 is therefore to be regarded as a change of the original composition.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### DELIVERY OF JERUSALEM AND LIBERATION OF JUDAH FROM THE ASSYRIANS. COMP. IS. XXXVII.

Vv. 1—4. After Hezekiah learned from his counsellors the speech of Rab-shakeh, he rent his clothes in horror at the daring mockery of God (v. 4), put on mourning garments as an external sign of the sorrow of his soul (comp. on 1 Ki. xxi. 27), and repaired to the temple, while he sent Eliakim and Shebna with the elders of the priests clad in mourning to the prophet Isaiah, to learn through him the answer of the Lord. *Ἀλλ' ὁ σοφώτατος βασιλεὺς οὐχ ὅπλα ταῖς ἐκείνου βλασφημίαις, ἀλλὰ προσευχὴν καὶ δάκρυα, καὶ σάκκον ἀντέταξε, καὶ τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν γενέσθαι πρεσβευτὴν ἠντιβόλησεν.* Theod. The position of the words, "Isaiah, the prophet, the son of Amoz," (v. 2), is unusual, (comp. xiv. 25, xx. 1; 1 Ki. xvi. 7; 2 Chr. xxvi. 22, etc.), and therefore changed in the narrative of Isaiah into "Isaiah, the son of Amoz, the prophet." V. 3, f. The delegates of the king beseech the prophet to intercede for the people still re-

maining, as the state was in a desperate condition and unable to help itself, and express the hope, that perhaps the Lord his God would hear the blasphemies, which Rab-shakeh uttered against the living God, that is, would observe and punish them. תּוֹכֵחָה Divine chastisement, נְאָצָה contempt, rejection of the people on the part of God, comp. נָאַץ in Deut. xxxii. 19; Jer. xiv. 21; Lam. ii. 6.—The expression borrowed from women in labour, "the children are come to the mouth of the womb, and there is not strength to bring forth," is used as a proverb to denote the highest danger, the most desperate condition and complete inability to help oneself. Hosea has a similar figure xiii. 13, and for a kindred proverb of the Arabs see Schultens *ad Job.* p. 31, and Ges. on Is. xxxvii. 3.—The designation of God as the living (חַי) stands with special emphasis in opposition to the heathen gods, which are only dead idols. וְהוֹכִיחַ according to Ges., Hitz., Knob. stands for וּלְהוֹכִיחַ "to revile;" but הוכיח never means to revile, or blame, find fault with, at least in the passages Gen. xxi. 25, and Ezek. iii. 26, quoted by Knobel, but only to admonish, correct, and cannot here be understood otherwise than תּוֹכֵחָה (v. 3); והוכיח is *praet. relat.* depending on the subject יְהוָה, "he will chastise him for the words, which Jehovah thy God hath heard." (Maur.) For this meaning of בְּ comp. xiv. 6, and Gen. xviii. 28.

Vv. 5—7. Isaiah answers in the name of the Lord, that Hezekiah is not to be afraid of the blasphemies he has heard from the young men of the king of Assyria, for the Lord will terrify him by a rumour, so that he will return to his own land, and cause him to fall there by the sword. נַעֲרֵי מֶלֶךְ the young men of the Assyrian king is a contemptuous designation of the Assyrian generals. רוּחַ means neither will nor sense, but the power of God operating on man and determining his spirit. Theod. has too narrow a view of it, *τὴν δειλίαν οἶμαι δηλοῦν.* שְׁמוּעָה is the report of the approach of Tirhakah, which Sennacherib very soon heard (v. 9.) The predicted death of Sennacherib also was accomplished (see v. 37.) But this prediction is not for that reason to be regarded as either a *vaticinium ex eventu* (Gesen.) or a mere presentiment of the politician Isaiah (Hitz. and Knob.),

for that at that time the plague had commenced in the Assyrian camp, as Knobel asserts, is a gratuitous assumption.

Vv. 8—13. Meanwhile Rab-shakeh had returned to his sovereign to Libnah, to which he had set out, probably after the taking of Lachish. Here Sennacherib heard the rumour of the approach of the Ethiopian sovereign Tirhakah, in hostile array, and therefore immediately made a second attempt, by sending messengers to Hezekiah with a letter (v. 14), to force the surrender of Jerusalem, inasmuch as he probably hoped, when in possession of this city, to be able to make head against the assaults of Tirhakah. Concerning Libnah comp. on viii. 22.—V. 9. אֶל תִּר׳, for which stands in Is. עַל תִּר׳, means in reference to Tir.—Tirhakah (תִּרְהָקָה, LXX. Θαρακά), is by general and unquestionably correct assumption, the Ταρακός of Manetho, the successor of Sevechos (xvii. 4), the third king of the twenty-fifth dynasty, and the Τεάρκων of Strabo (xv. 687), who reigned, according to Jul. Afric., in Syncell. (i. p. 39, ed. Dind.) eighteen years, according to Euseb. in Sync. (p. 140), twenty years, according to which Hitz. (Is. p. 222) fixes the period of his reign at 714—696, but Knobel, (Is. p. 127), at 717—696 B.C., comp. des Vignoles *chronol.* ii. p. 130 ff., and Archinard, *chronol.* p. 67 and 85. Although here designated king of Ethiopia, he ruled at the same time over Egypt, and is represented, like Sesostris, as one of the great conquerors of the old world, who penetrated to Europe and the pillars of Hercules (Strabo *l.c.*) But how far Tirhakah had already advanced cannot be determined from our verse. It was enough that this report was a motive to Sennacherib for effecting, if possible, the surrender of Jerusalem. Instead of וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּשְׁלַח, "he sent again" stands in Is. וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁלַח, "when he heard (this) he sent," which perhaps is more original than our text. As Rab-shakeh had effected nothing by his vainglorious speech, Sennacherib sent messengers with a letter, in which he only repeats what was brought forward by Rab-shakeh and merely enumerates still more of the lands conquered by the Assyrians than the former had named, in order to make a still stronger impression of the irresistible might of the Assyrian arms on Hezekiah. V. 11. לְהַחֲרִימָם properly to excommuni-

cate, to strike with a curse, comp. Num. xx. 3; Deut. ii. 34, iii. 6, etc., here in the general sense, "to destroy them."—וְאַתָּה תִּנָּצֵל, "and shalt thou be delivered?" a question implying a strong negative. V. 12. Gozan may here be Gauzanitis of Mesopotamia, but equally well a properly Assyrian province or district beyond the Tigris, as Gauzania (comp. on xvii. 6); for its collocation with Haran does not certainly warrant the presumption that the two places were contiguous, as the enumeration is historical, not geographical. חָרָן, حَرَّان, ܚܪܢ, *Χαῤῥάν* (LXX.), Haran, from חָרַר to glow, scorch, as it were a dry scorched region (حَرَّان), an ancient city in the north west of Mesopotamia, in which Terah, Abraham's father, died (Gen. xi. 31), situated according to Abulf. in an arid region, which traded with Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 23), called by the Greeks and Romans *Κάῤῥαι*, *Carræ*, and celebrated for the defeat of Crassus in its vicinity, exists still according to Pococke, Beschr. d. Morgenl. ii. p. 235, and Niebuhr, Reise ii. p. 410, as a small place two days' journey southeast of Orfa under the old name. See the proofs in Rosenm. bibl. Althk: i. 2, p. 149, Winer's R.W. i. p. 545, Ges. *thes.* i. 528, and Forbiger's Hdb. ii. p. 629. רֶצֶף Rezeph is the Arab. رُصَافَة. Under this name Jakuti in his geogr. W.B. enumerates nine cities, of which the most celebrated was الرصافة or رصافة هشام, probably the same, that Ptolem. (v. 15) calls *Ῥησάφα*, in Palmyrene, on the way from Racca to Emesa, a day's journey west of the Euphrates. This is the place thought of by Mich. *Suppl.* p. 2264, Rosenm. Athlk. i. 2, p. 269, Win. R.W. ii. 381, and Ges. *thes.* iii. 1308; on the contrary Hitz. (Is. p. 424) understands by it another city of this name situated according to Abulf. in the district of Bagdad, because רצף by the omission of the particle את is separated from חרן and connected with the following בני עדן, a somewhat precarious argument, although the other assumption also rests on no decisive ground. בְּנֵי עֶדֶן "the sons, that is, inhabitants of Eden." עדן is perhaps not the Damascene Eden or Betheden (Am. i. 15), a city in a charming region on Lebanon, three

hours from Kanobin, called in Ptolem. v. 15 *Παράδεισος*, which still exists under the old name Eden (comp. Winer, R.W. i. p. 198, and Ges. *thes.* i. 195), but the Assyrian Eden, which is also named in Ezek. xxvii. 33, along with Haran and Calneh as an important place of trade. But this is not the Arabic عَدَن on the Indian Ocean (Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1840), but probably the tract ܥܕܢ, which Assemanni (bibl. or ii. 224) places in Mesopotamia towards the Tigris in the present province of Diar-bekr (comp. Winer, R.W., i. p. 334, Ges. *thes.* ii. 995, Hitz. on Is., etc.)[1] תְּלַאשָּׂר Telassar, Gesen., Win., and others take to be the same with אֶלָּסָר Ellasar (Gen. xiv. 1); but, first of all, this assumption is extremely uncertain (comp. Tuch on Gen. p. 72), and then Ellasar is likewise completely unknown. The phrase "the sons of Eden, who were in Telassar," is probably to be understood so that Telassar was a city or even the capital of the district of Eden.

Vv. 14—19. Hezekiah brings Sennacherib's letter into the temple and spreads it before the Lord, that he may observe and punish the taunts it contained. The spreading of the letter before the Lord in the temple, wherein unbelief can only think of the praying machine of the Tibetans (Ges. on Is. xxxvii. 14), is explained by that childlike confidence of faith, which feels itself impelled to utter in prayer all the concerns of the heart before the all-knowing God, although he as all-knowing sees and knows all things, before man presents them to him. סְפָרִים means not letters, but a letter, as *litteræ;* for Sennacherib had no occasion to write several letters on the same subject to Hezekiah. Hence also the singular suffix in וַיִּפְרְשֵׂהוּ, whereas יִקְרָאֵם standing nearer to סְפָרִים has a plural suffix, which is changed into יִקְרָאֵהוּ in Is. for the sake of uniformity.

[1] On the contrary Hävern. Comm. on Ezek. p. 473 identifies Eden with the place of this name mentioned by *Stephan. s.v.* Ἄδανα on the Euphrates, inasmuch as he following Bochart (Phal. iv. 18) and Vitringa on Is. xxxviii. 12 takes תלאשר or תלשר to be the same with the city Thalatha mentioned by Ptolem. below the junction of the Euphrates and Tigris (see *Cellarii geogr. lib.* iii. c. 16, p. 641.) But this assumption is in the highest degree uncertain, although Telassar cannot be otherwise ascertained; comp. Mich. *Spicil.* i. p. 251 f.

How clear was Hezekiah's recognition of God is shown by his prayer (v. 15), in which he connects the condescending grace of the Lord who sits over the cherubim of the mercy-seat in the sublimest manner with his true Godhead and sovereignty over all kingdoms as creator of heaven and earth (comp. above 125.) In direct opposition to the fancy of the Assyrians he designates Jehovah the God of Israel as the only God, Lord and creator of the whole world. *'Εκεῖνοί σε, φησὶν, ἕνα νομίζουσι τῶν πολλῶν τῶν οὐκ ὄντων· ἐγὼ δέ σε μόνον οἶδα θεὸν, ποιητὴν τῶν ἀπάντων.* Theod. Equally happy is the remark of the same father on the following words, "bow down thine ear and hear," *τὸ δέ κλῖνον καὶ ἄκουσον ἀνθρωπίνως τέθεικε, μετ' εὐμενείας δεχθῆναι τὴν ἱκετείαν ἀντιβολῶν.*—In v. 15 after יְהוָה stands in Is. צְבָאוֹת, which the prophets, especially Isaiah, frequently use, but which occurs in the historical writings only in the mouth of the prophets (see iii. 14, 1 Ki. xviii. 15.) On "אַתָּה הוּא וגו comp. Ew. Gr. § 548. The plur. עֵינֶיךָ in contrast with the sing. אָזְנְךָ is alone correct, inasmuch as the constant phrase, to incline the ear (Ps. xvii. 6, xxxi. 3, xlv. 11, and others, even in the plural, incline your ear, אָזְנְכֶם Ps. lxxviii. 1; Is. lv. 3) and to open the eyes (Job xxvii. 19; Prov. xx. 13; Zech. xii. 4; Dan. ix. 18); because we always open both eyes to see anything, whereas one ear is inclined to the speaker. In the text of Is. stands עֵינְךָ, which is perhaps also plural, only written *defective*, as 1 Ki. viii. 29; Job xiv. 3.—The suffix in אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ, which is wanting in Isaiah, belongs to אֲשֶׁר and refers as this to דִּבְרֵי, inasmuch as דברים has the singular meaning *speech*, "the speech, which Sennacherib has written in his letter." V. 17 ff. After Hezekiah has besought the Lord to regard, that is, resent the insults of his majesty on the part of Sennacherib, he mentions the fact, that the Assyrians devastated the nations and their lands, and burned their gods in the fire, but immediately adds in explanation of this, that these gods were not God, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone, and founds on this the petition, that the Lord would, by saving Judah from the hand of the Assyrians, show all the kingdoms of the earth, that he Jehovah was God alone. Instead of "הֶחֱרִיבוּ אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם וגו . . .

"the kings of Assyria have destroyed the nations and their lands," the text of Isaiah has, אֶת־כָּל־הָאֲרָצוֹת וגו' "all the lands and their (own) land," obviously the more difficult and original reading, which our author has changed, in order to set aside the not so easily understood thought, that by making war on foreign lands they at the same time desolated their own land, that is, they depopulated and thereby desolated it with their continued wars. Ges., Hitz., Knob., and others, explain the deviation otherwise, but incorrectly, see my apol. Vers. p. 230. וְנָתְנוּ also of our text is easier and more usual than וְנָתוֹן in Isaiah. The same holds good of the addition אֱלֹהִים after יְהוָה in v. 19, inasmuch as the use of Jehovah as predicate, "that thou art Jehovah alone" (comp. Neh. ix. 6) is rare, and therefore also was misunderstood by Gesen. ("that thou Jehovah alone art this, namely, that which is only falsely asserted of idols.")

V. 20 ff. When Hezekiah prayed to the Lord, Isaiah received a Divine revelation with respect to the prayer of the pious king. This word of the Lord, which the prophet sends, that is, causes to be presented to the king, contains three sections. In the first (vv. 21—28, in Is. vv. 22—29) Sennacherib is addressed; in the second (vv. 29—31, in Is. vv. 30—32), Hezekiah; in the third (vv. 32—34, in Is. vv. 33—35), the issue of the expedition of Sennacherib against Judah is announced in brief but very definite terms. In the very introduction (v. 20), according to our narrative the following prophecy is announced to king Hezekiah as the fruit of his prayer being heard. In Is. שָׁמַעְתִּי is wanting, so that the words, "What thou hast prayed to me in reference to Sennacherib," are to be connected with the following verse: "this is the word which Jehovah hath spoken concerning him." This was obviously the original text, and the author of our books has simplified the construction by the insertion of שמעתי, whereas Ges., according to his erroneous view of the mutual relation of the two narratives, asserts the contrary.

Vv. 21—24. The prediction begins with opposing to the haughty boasting of the Assyrian, the contempt and infamy which would befal him on his retreat from Judah without having effected his purpose. With the vivacity of poetry the language is addressed to Sennacherib himself. The virgin, the

daughter Zion, despises thee, derides thee; the daughter Jerusalem shaketh her head after thee. The phrase, daughter Zion, daughter Jerusalem, denotes not the inhabitants of Zion of Jerusalem, so that בַּת is put collectively for בָּנִים, as Ges., Hitz., Maur., Knob., think, but the city itself, with its inhabitants poetically personified as a daughter or virgin; and the *stat. constr.* בַּת־צִיּוֹן is to be understood according to the analogy of נְהַר־פְּרָת the river Euphrates (not of Euphrates); daughter Zion, not, daughter of Zion. So the *stat. constr.* בְּתוּלַת בַּת is to be taken simply in the sense of apposition, not of subordination; comp. Ew. Kr. Gr. p. 579. The daughter Zion is called בְּתוּלָה in reference to the Assyrian as a citadel inaccessible to him, not to be conquered by him. Comp. the illustrations of this figure collected from Arabic writers by Gesen. on Is. xxiii. 12. הֵנִיעַ רֹאשׁ, κινεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν (LXX.), to shake the head is among the Hebrews a gesture of scorn and vindictive exultation; comp. Ps. xxii. 8, cix. 25, Lam. ii. 15. אַחֲרֶיךָ after thee, that is, after thee retreating with disgrace.—Vv. 22—25. With his blasphemies, and his foolish boasting of his invincible might, Sennacherib had reviled the Lord, the Holy One of Israel. In v. 22 the reviling of Sennacherib is in the first place represented in a series of questions as a reviling of the Lord. וַתִּשָּׂא וגו׳ "and hast lifted up thine eyes on high against the Holy One of Israel," that is, not, thou hast directed thy proud glance against Jehovah (Gesen.); for רוּם עֵינַיִם height of eyes, = lofty eyes, is not proper here; מָרוֹם is the accusative of direction, comp. Is. xi. 26, and the phrase, to lift the eyes on high (to heaven), has not in itself, as the passage quoted proves, the secondary bad sense of haughtiness, but assumes it only in connection with עַל־קְדוֹשׁ יִשׂ׳ *against* the Holy One of Israel, or merely through the context, as in Is., where אֶל קְד׳ stands for עַל־קְד׳. The designation of God, "the Holy One of Israel," that is, who manifests his holiness in and on Israel, belongs to the peculiarities of Isaiah's phraselogy, and occurs in Is. twenty-seven times and only three times elsewhere in the whole Old Testa-

ment (Ps. lxxi. 22; lxxviii. 41; lxxxix. 19), as the passages Jer. l. 29 and li. 5, as acknowledged imitations of Isaiah, are not to be reckoned; comp. Kleinert, Echth. des Jes. i. p. 221.—In v. 23—25 it is more distinctly stated in what the reviling of the Lord consisted. In the supercilious boasting of his own all-grasping power, whereby Sennacherib, as Hab. i. 11 says of the Chaldeans, made his power to be his God. This boasting is in a strain of genuine poetry couched in a speech, in which Sennacherib declares that he can and will, with his warlike force, ascend the highest and most inaccessible mountains, destroy the most glorious creations of God, and rule over the earth according to his arbitrary will. But at the same time this individualizing of the general thought is put in the closest relation with Sennacherib's actually conceived plans of conquest in Canaan and Egypt, as the naming of Lebanon with its noble forests and of the river of Egypt clearly indicates. וַתֹּאמֶר "that thou saidst." By the Vau *relat.* the explanatory sentence is subordinated to the principal sentence in the form of an immediate consequence (Ew. Gr. § 611.) The words, "With my chariots upon chariots I ascended the height of the mountains, the utmost sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall cedars thereof and the choice cypresses thereof, and will come to the extreme lodging thereof, to the forest of its garden," are not to be taken with the exeg. Hdb. for a historical description of that which Sennacherib had already done or wished still to do, or with Gesen., Hitz., Knob., in a purely figurative sense for a poetical description of the otherwise frequent thought, "to go upon the heights of the earth," according to which the hewing down of the cedars would denote the fall of princes, kings, and warriors. Both are equally false. The words are an individualizing picture of the plans of conquest entertained by the Assyrian, in which Lebanon is named on the one hand as a mountain inaccessible to chariots, on the other as the northern barrier of the land of Canaan, by the conquest of which he would have made himself master of the country, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 201 f., and Delitsch, Hab. p. 94. So far then as Lebanon is put by synecdoche for the whole land, of which it formed the frontier, the hewing down of its cedars and cypresses, those glorious evidences of the creative power of God, denotes the devastation of

the whole land with all its glorious works of nature and art. בְּרֶכֶב רִכְבִּי, for which stands in the *Keri* and in Is. בְּרֹב רִכְבִּי, as the rarer diction, has the presumption of originality in its favour. ברכב רכבי "my chariots upon chariots" is a highly poetical designation of a countless multitude of chariots, as גּוֹב גּוֹבָי of a countless multitude of locusts (Nah. iii. 17.) The expression, "the height of the mountains," is enhanced by יַרְכְּתֵי לְבָנוֹן, "the utmost sides of Lebanon;" for Lebanon is the highest mountain of Palestine, and the utmost sides of it are its highest ridges, as יַרְכְּתֵי בוֹר (Is. xiv. 15, and Ezek. xxxii. 23) are the utmost depths of Sheol. קוֹמַת אֲרָזָיו, the height of his cedars = his highest and most slender cedars. מִבְחוֹר בְּרוֹשָׁיו, the choice of his cypresses = his choicest cypresses. The form מִבְחוֹר stands here as in iii. 19 for מִבְחַר, but does not occur elsewhere. מְלוֹן קִצֹּה, "the lodge of its end," that is, the highest point of Lebanon, on which man can repose; and we are not to imagine with Cler., Vitr., and Rosenm., a determinate lodge built on the highest pinnacle of Lebanon. The מְלוֹן of our text is fairly taken in general to be more original than the מְרוֹם of Is. יַעַר כַּרְמִלּוֹ its garden forest, כַּרְמֶל a garden-like plantation of trees, comp. Is. x. 18. By this is obviously to be understood the garden-like cedar forest, which stood on a small area between the highest summits at the present village Bsherreh, comp. above p. 65.—V. 24 refers to Sennacherib's intended expedition against Egypt, which was opposed by two mighty natural obstacles, the arid desert el Tih (comp. Herodot. iii. 5, and Rob. Pal. i. p. 296 f.), and the arms of the Nile which protect Egypt. These two obstacles the proud king imagines he can easily overcome. In the wilderness he digs and drinks strange water, and he dries up the rivers of Egypt with sole of his feet. The *praeter.* קַרְתִּי שָׁתִיתִי denote only that which is certain to come to pass, and are to be translated by the *praes.*; for Sennacherib had not yet entered the desert. By the epithet, *strange* water, it is indicated that the haughty sovereign intends to rule over the water in a foreign land as in his own, though it is so difficult to obtain in a wilderness. Even the arms of the Nile

are to dry up under the footsteps of his innumerable host. מָצוֹר here and in Is. xix. 6, Mic. vii. 12, denotes Egypt.[1]

Vv. 25—28. This boasting is very foolish, as Jehovah has long since decreed all this and now causes it to come to pass, and therefore the Assyrian, without being willing to know and acknowledge it, acts only as the instrument of the Lord, who has furnished him with power to destroy, who knows all his ways, and will soon restrain his rage against him, the true God.[2] The words, "from afar I have done it, from the days of old I have formed it," denote the Divine ordering and governing of all events, subsisting since the beginning of things, comp. Is. xxii. 11, xlvi. 11. The suffixes in אֹתָהּ, יְצַרְתִּיהָ and הֲבֵיאתִיהָ refer to the following וּתְהִי לְהַשְׁוֹת, "that there be to destroy," that is, that fenced cities be destroyed into ruinous heaps. Many expositors, including Gesen., Knobel, and Hendewerk, regard תְּהִי as the second person; that thou shouldst be, tend, to destroy; but against this is on the one hand the reference of תהי to the preceding suffixes, which require תהי to be regarded as the third person, *gen. neutr.*, on the other the peculiar usage of Isaiah, in which הָיָה with an infinitive following is only a circumlocution for the passive, for example, הָיָה לְבָעֵר is to burn—will or ought to be burned, Is. v. 5, vi. 13, xliv. 15; comp. Kleinert,

[1] Herewith the expositors following Bochart (Hieroz. ii. lib. 5, c. 15 p. 766) very appropriately compare the similar boasting of Alaric in *Claudian de. bell. Geth. vs.* 526 *ss.*

*. . . . cum cesserit omnis*
*Obsequiis natura meis? Subsidere nostris*
*Sub pedibus montes, arescere vidimus amnes*
*. . . . . . . . . .*

V. 532: *Fregi Alpes, galeis Padum victricibus hausi.*

[2] Comp. as an actual parallel, Is. x. 5 ff. This prediction belongs without doubt to the first period of the Assyrian invasion, when Sennacherib advanced against Judah to take all the fenced cities. If the modern expositors of Isaiah, on account of a supposed difference, namely, that in Is. x. 28—34, the Assyrian army is to set out from the north to Jerusalem, but in our narrative from the south-west (xviii. 17), have placed this prediction in other times and referred it to other events, this could only happen under the supposition, that a prediction expressed in an individualizing picture is a chronological bulletin of the warlike operations of the Assyrian army.

Echth. des Jes. p. 275 f. That תְּהִי לְהַשּׁוֹת is to be explained according to this idiom, "there is to destroy = there are to be destroyed," is obvious, though it has not been observed by any of the recent expositors of Isaiah. On the form לְהַשּׁוֹת for לְהַשְׁאוֹת (*Keri* and in Is.) comp. Ges. Lehrgeb. p. 137.—V. 26 still depends on the foregoing. This also comes from Jehovah, that the inhabitants of the cities devoted to destruction are weak and frail, and can easily be conquered by the Assyrians. קִצְרֵי־יָד short of hand, that is, powerless. The hand is the instrument of active power; the short-hand is therefore a figure of inability to deliver oneself, comp. Num. xi. 23; Is. l. 2, lix. 1. The opposite is *μακρόχειρ*, *longimanus*, that is, the mighty, the high and mighty, the well-known surname of Artaxerxes I. The comparison with the grass of the field, the green herb, denotes the frailty, the rapid withering away, Ps. xxxvii. 2, xc. 5 f.; Is. xl. 6 f. etc. חֲצִיר גַּגּוֹת grass of the roofs, that sprouts forth on the floor of the roofs, and still sooner withers, because it can strike no deep roots, Ps. cxxix. 6. שְׁדֵפָה לִפְנֵי קָמָה "corn blasted before the stalk," that is, corn which is blasted and dries up, before it shoots up into stalks. For שְׁדֵפָה stands in Is. שדמה with a change of the labial, which is not to be confounded with שְׁדֵמָה *field*, but not *seed*, as Knobel thinks, see Delitsch, Habak. p. 197. In vv. 27 and 28 judgment is pronounced on Sennacherib. The Lord knows his ways and rage against him, and will therefore control him as an irrational animal, and lead him back to his country without having attained his object. The sitting and going in and out denote not merely the doing, but the collective doings of men; as the sitting and rising in Ps. cxxxix. 2. Instead of rising it is usual to say going in and out, Deut. xxviii. 6; Ps. cxxi. 8.—שַׁאֲנָן to be quiet (v. 28) denotes the security, that is conscious of its own strength, therefore the security of haughtiness, confident haughtiness—"and because (יַעַן is to be repeated) thy haughtiness is come to mine ears, I will put a ring in thy nose, a bridle in thy lips (mouth.)" The figurative expression is taken from wild animals, which men restrain in this way, the ring in the nose of lions (Ezek. xix. 4), and other wild beasts (Ezek. xxix. 4; Is.

xxx. 28), the bridle in the mouth of intractable horses (Ps. xxxii. 9.) "To turn any one back by the way by which he came," means to send him back disappointed in his object.

Vv. 29—31. This sentence concerning the end of the under takings of Sennacherib is more fully particularized in the last section of our prediction, first, however, in the second section (vv. 29—31) a sign is given to Hezekiah for the confirmation of its truth. The אוֹת, σημεῖον is here no miracle, no מוֹפֵת as 1 Ki. xiii. 3, but consists in the foretelling of natural and nearer events, which serve to accredit the proper prediction, on the contrary Is. viii. 14, in the presaging of a supernatural event, which, while connected with the expectation of the people, was given for the confirmation of a prophecy more difficult to be believed when the view was directed only to the visible state of present things. The purport of the sign is, that this and the next year the country will be still occupied by the enemies, so that men cannot ordinarily sow and reap, but must live on that which grows without sowing; but in the third year they will again be able to cultivate their fields and vineyards, and reap as usual. The *infin. absol.* אָכוֹל stands not for the perfect, but for the imperative, as the following imperatives show, comp. Ew. Gr. § 583.—סָפִיחַ new growth, after growth (from ספה-ספח to add, annex,[1] properly what is added to that which is already gained in the previous harvest, comp. Delitsch, Hab. p. 88) denotes the corn which comes up from the dropped seed of the previous year, Lev. xxv. 5—11. סָחִישׁ or with transposition of the letters שָׁחִיס in Is. Abulwal. explains, "that which germinates from the root of the seed." The etymology of the word is uncertain, it cannot therefore be determined which form the original and which is the transposed.[2] V. 30 f. The remnant that is escaped

[1] The current explanation of ספיח from سفح *effudit, effusum*, "that which grows from the dropped grains of the previous harvest," is proved to be inadmissible by Lev. xxv. 11.

[2] Neither the Arabic سحس *elata est (vox), sustulit (visum) in cœlum*, which Ges. compares in *lex.*, nor شخس, *dispersus, dissipatus est*, which Winer in *lex.* proposes, presents a suitable meaning, and the old writers only conjectured from the context and fluctuated (comp.

of the house of Judah will again grow and flourish, for out of Jerusalem will go forth a remnant that has escaped. The theocratic people will not be exterminated by this judgment, but only winnowed through the jealousy of the Lord, who cannot utterly cast off his chosen people and leave them to perish by the heathen. פְּלֵיטָה denotes those who have escaped destruction in the judgment, Is. iv. 2, x. 20. The deliverance is connected with Jerusalem and Mount Zion, from which, according to Is. ii. 3, the salvation of the Messiah is to go forth, and is based upon the קִנְאַת יְהוָֹה, as in Is. ix. 6, the appearance of the Messiah for the establishment of the eternal kingdom of peace and righteousness. For the deliverance of the covenant-people from the power of the Assyrians, is a type of the deliverance of the people of God from the bondage of sin and death through the Messiah. קנאת יהוה, is the jealousy of Jehovah's love, which cannot altogether and for ever reject his betrothed and confiding people. Comp. the remarks on קִנֵּא p. 210. After יהוה the צבאות, which is quite in keeping with the phraseology of Isaiah (Is. v. 22), is omitted in our text, comp. Is. ix. 6.

Vv. 32—34. After this sign given to Hezekiah, the prophecy returns to Sennacherib, announcing that he will not come to Jerusalem, besiege or shoot against it, but return without having effected his purpose, because the Lord defends it to save it for the sake of his promise.[1] קִדֵּם with double accus. means to come to meet any one with anything, sometimes *sensu bono*, for ex. Ps. xxi. 4, sometimes *hostili modo*, as here, with shield to advance against (the city.) V. 34. "For mine own sake and for my servant David's sake," that is, because Jehovah as the covenant-God, unchangeable in his engagements, must perform his promise made to David, comp. the remarks on 1 Ki. xi. 13, above p. 171.

Mich. *Suppl.* p. 1739 f.) J. Fürst (Concord. p. 762 f.) takes חוש to be the root, which has *vim status exsucculenti, aridi atque serotini*, and explains סָחִישׁ *planta serotina quae tempore succositatis praeterito germinat*, an aftershoot.

[1] The reasons for which Hitz. and Hendew. wish to refuse these verses to Isaiah, have been already rejected as inconclusive by Knobel.

Vv. 35—37. In v. 35, f., the historical fulfilment is immediately annexed to the prediction, although, in reality, about two years intervened in order to conclude the narrative of Sennacherib's invasion with this chapter. There is a difficulty in the expression וַיְהִי בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא, "and it came to pass that night," because no night is mentioned in the preceding context, to which הַהוּא might refer. The whole particulars can only refer to the time when Sennacherib advanced to Jerusalem to commence the siege, for this is the point of time given in the verses immediately before, which is to be placed about two years after that prediction of the prophet, or, which is the same thing, after the sending of the messengers of Sennacherib, mentioned in v. 9, ff., to summon Hezekiah to surrender Jerusalem.[1] מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, "the angel of the Lord," is the same, who as מַשְׁחִית, "the

[1] Most of the old interpreters erroneously understand בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא of the night, which followed the day in which Isaiah delivered his prophecy, with which they reconcile the determination of time in the sign given to Hezekiah (v. 29), by the aid of a sabbatical year, which Scaliger places in the thirteenth, most others in the fifteenth or sixteenth year of Hezekiah's reign (comp. Vitr. *ad Jes.* xxxvii. 30), or even by the assumption of a sabbatical year followed by a jubilee year (see J. Ode *de anno Hebr. jubil.* in Oelrich's *collectio opusc. hist. phil. theol.* ii. p. 461, 484), while Hitzig, who thus understands בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא, offers no explanation. This assumption is opposed not only by the want of any allusion to the sabbatical or jubilee year in either text, but also by the circumstance, that the sentence of the prophet, "this year and the following sabbatical year (or in this sabbatical and the following jubilee year), ye will live on that which grows without sowing, but in the third year again ye will be able to sow and reap," could scarcely be a sign given by God for the satisfaction of Hezekiah, as it left him entirely uncertain whether the present severe oppression on the part of the Assyrians would cease immediately or only after two years. Equally inadmissible is the expedient, by which Gesen. proposed to obviate the difficulties, that is, to take the *infin. abs.* אָכוֹל (v. 29), as *praeter.*, and so determine the sense of the verse thus, "Two years has the land now been wasted by the enemy, so that there was neither sowing nor reaping, in this third year delivered from the enemy ye will again sow and reap." For that אָכוֹל cannot here be understood of the past, was already remarked on v. 29, and that בַּשָּׁנָה הַשְּׁלִישִׁית cannot mean, in this third, that is, in the present year, does not require to be remarked.

destroying angel," smote the first-born of the Egyptians (Ex. xiii. 23, comp. with vv. 12, 13), and after the enumeration of the people in David's time, inflicted the punishment of pestilence on Israel (2 Sam. xxiv. 16), from whom proceed as well the preservation and protection of the true members of the theocracy as the destruction of all their enemies, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 202 f. The means which he employed for the destruction of the Assyrian host, was most probably a fearfully violent pestilence, as in David's time (2 Sam. xxiv. 13, 15 f.), and perhaps also in the death of the first-born, comp. Hengstenb. d. BB. Mos. u. Aeg. p. 126 ff.[1] וַיַּשְׁכִּימוּ וגו׳, "and when they (*sc. pauci qui reliqui erant*, J. H. Mich., to whom belonged the king himself), arose in the morning, behold they were all (the 185,000 men), dead corpses." פְּגָרִים "lifeless bodies," is used of the bodies of men as well as animals. According to Hengstenb. (Christol. iii. p. 597), it properly stands only for animal bodies,

[1] As the plague often carried away several thousand men in one day, but in no other account were 185,000 men killed by it in one night, Gesen., Hitz., Knobel, and others, who think of nothing more than a natural plague, pronounce partly the statement, "in one night," which is also implied in the parallel narrative of Isaiah, although it has not בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא, partly the number of the slain to be a mythical exaggeration, in reply to which Hendew. thinks that no one will consider the number mythical, who has any historical knowledge of the frightful ravages which the plague makes, and is aware that for example in 1714, it swept away 300,000 men in Constantinople, and often carries off 30,000 in Smyrna (Jahn's Archæol. i. 2, p. 392), while in an army stationed in a hostile country, it might easily effect a still more extensive desolation. This defence of the historical truth of our narrative is still weaker than the attack upon it, as the expositors, whom Hendew. opposes, have quoted before him the self-same fact, from Jahn's Archæol. But according to the express statement of our narrative the destruction of the Assyrian army was no mere natural consequence of a plague breaking out in the country, but a Divine judgment executed by the angel of the Lord, which is not to be measured by the rationalistic standard of an ordinary plague, even if the plague was the means by which the army of the proud Sennacherib was destroyed. There is great probability in the opinion of Vitringa on Is. xxxvii. 36, *in tempestate horribili ab Angelo excitata haec hominum millia prostrata esse fulmine, corporibus intus adustis, vestibus salvis.*—The various natural explanations of the miracle, for example, by the poisonous simoom, by an earthquake, by a nocturnal attack of Tirhakah, by the poisoning of the water and the provisions, and the

but is afterwards transferred to the bodies of those, who by their wickedness have incurred the Divine judgment and been destroyed by it.[1] V. 36. The accumulation of the verbs וַיִּסַּע וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיָּשָׁב, "departed and went and returned," expresses the haste with which Sennacherib departed. Nineveh נִינְוֵה, that is, dwelling of Ninus, called by the Greeks and Romans *Nῖνος*,

like, are enumerated in the exeget. Hdb. on the passage and in Winer's R.W. i. p. 587 f.—In the parallel passage 2 Chr. xxxii. 21 the number of the dead is not given, but it is merely said, "The angel of the Lord destroyed all the valiant men and leaders and captains in the camp of the Assyrian king," a statement which Gramberg in his blind zeal against Chronicles, and copying him Winer (R.W. i. p. 588) have distorted into this, that according to Chr. "*only* the leaders and officers" were killed.

[1] Herodotus (ii. 141) gives a very distorted tradition of this defeat of Sennacherib, without doubt after the narrative of the Egyptian priests, according to which the Deity promised to king Sethon a priest of Vulcan at his entreaty the victory over the mighty advancing host of Sennacherib, whereupon in the night mice spread themselves among the foes (in the Assyrian camp), and gnawed the quivers, bows, and straps of the shields, so that they were obliged to flee the next morning without weapons, and many of them were put to the sword. That in this priestly legend the defeat of the Assyrians is ascribed to mice, J. D. Mich. explained by the fact, that among the Egyptians the mouse was the hieroglyph of devastation and extermination (comp. *Horapoll. Hieroglyph.* i. 50.) As historical element of the legend this only can be retained, that the knowledge of the annihilation of the Assyrian army by a miraculous interposition of the Diety had reached the Egyptians, and that they ascribed it to the prayers of their king, inasmuch as the expedition of Sennacherib was directed at the same time against Egypt. Nothing more can be inferred from it, certainly not that Sennacherib actually advanced to the district of Pelusium. On the contrary we may without hesitation infer from the definite predictions of Isaiah in our chapter, especially in vv. 32—34 and in Is. x. 32—34, that Sennacherib himself, after his messengers, sent from Libnah with a letter by his own hand to Hezekiah, could not procure the surrender of Jerusalem, and after he had taken all the other fenced cities of Judah, advanced with his whole army against Jerusalem the capital, in order to conquer it by force of arms, and that here his army was smitten by the destroying angel, before he had actually begun the siege. This conjecture has also, irrespective of these predictions, the greatest probability in itself. For if the report of the approach of Tirhakah induced him to make every effort to force the surrender of Jerusalem, he would not certainly venture, after the failure of his negotiations there, to advance towards Egypt, so long as he had not conquered Hezekiah and taken Jerusalem.

*Ninus*, the capital of the Assyrian empire, and residence of the Assyrian kings, built by Nimrod (Gen. x. 11), a very great and strong city. According to Jon. i. 2, iii. 3, iv. 11, it was a great city of three days' journey; according to Diod. Sicul. ii. 33 it was 480 stad. in circumference, and had very high and extremely thick walls, and was almost impregnable as well by these walls as by its position on the eastern bank of the Tigris, but yet was taken in 625 B.C. by Cyaxares of Media and Nabopolassar of Babylon, and razed to the ground (comp. our remarks on xv. 19), so that from that time only heaps of ruins remain, on which at present opposite Mosul stand several villages, as Nunia or Nebbi Yunus, Nimrud, Kalta, Numia, and Khorsabad, خرسباد. Comp. Rosenm. Althk. i. 2, p. 94 ff. 114 ff., Gesen. *thes.* ii. 881 f., Winer R.W. ii. p. 187 ff. and Forbiger Hdb. ii. p. 611. Only two years ago the French consul Botta at Mosul caused diggings to be made in these ruins, by which, especially in the village Khorsabad, many interesting remains of masonry with sculptures and cuneiform inscriptions were brought to light. Comp. the description and drawings of these in the Journ. Asiat. quatr. série tom. ii. sqq. Paris 1842—43.—V. 37. In conclusion the fate of Sennacherib is recorded. That his murder did not occur immediately after his disgraceful return, appears from the clause, "and dwelt at Nineveh." He must have lived fourteen or fifteen years longer. Nothing certain is known of the god Nisroch (נִסְרֹךְ.) Most derive the word from נֶשֶׁר, نسر, an eagle, with reference to the circumstance, that the Oriental astronomers call two constellations eagles (comp. Ideler, Urspr. der Sternnamen p. 416), that the eagle was adored by the ancient Arabs (Pococke, *spec.* p. 94, 199) and in the Persian religion was a symbol of Ormuzd; comp. Comm. on Is. i. p. 975 f. and Win. R.W. ii. p. 189. Other explanations see in Selden *de Diis Syr.* ii. 10 and *Addit.* p. 323 f., Carpz. *Appar.* p. 519 and Gesen. *thes.* ii. 892.—Movers (Rel. d. Phŏn. i. p. 68, 506 f.) takes Nisroch to be the supreme deity of the Assyrians, of whom Philo in Euseb. præp. ev. i. 10 says, "that Zoroaster teaches, that the supreme deity is represented by the eagle's head, and also assumes, that the same corresponds to the Egyptian Sun-god Phre with the head of an eagle or hawk.—Sennacherib's murderers were his

sons Adrammelech, who according to widely prevalent custom (comp. Gesen. on Is. vii. 6) derived his name from deity, and from him indeed whom the inhabitants of Sepharvaim worshipped (xvii. 31) and Sharezer (שַׁרְאֶצֶר), that is, probably prince of fire. בָּנָיו moreover is wanting in our text. The country of Ararat is a part of the Armenian highlands, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 155. Ararat still denotes the highest summit of a branch of the great Taurus range, which rises in two peaks far above the other mountains on the high table land of the Araxes, twelve hours southwest of the city Eriwan. This is the *mons Abus* covered with perpetual snow, ὁ Ἄβος of Strabo, Plin. and Ptolem., called by the Persians Kuhi Nuch, or Noah's mountain. The highest peak of it, the great Ararat, Aghri Dagh, rises, according to the measurements of Parrot, who ascended it for the first time, Sept. 22—28, 1829, 13,530 feet above the plain of Araxes, and has an absolute height of 16,254 feet. The Little Ararat, Kutshuk Dagh or Kutshuk Aghri Dagh rises 12,284 feet above the level of the sea. Comp. Fr. Parrot's Reise Zum Ararat, Berlin, 1834, second part, and the extracts from it in Ritter's Erdk. x. p. 477 ff., 486 ff.—"And Esarhaddon his son became king in his stead." This king, whose name אֵסַר־חַדֹּן, Ἀσορδάν, Ἀσαραδάν (Ezr. iv. 2 LXX.) is not yet satisfactorily explained (comp. Gesen. and Hitz. on Is. xxxvii. 38 and Ges. *thes.* i. 133) is mentioned also in Ezr. iv. 2 and Tob. i. 21 (Σαχερδονός, Cod. Al. Σαχερδών, Compl. Ἀχειρδωνός) and by Berosus in *Euseb. chron. arm.* p. 19 f. under the name *Asordanus* according with the LXX. According to Berosus he was first viceroy of Babylon, afterwards eight years king of Assyria. In the canon of Ptol. he is called Ἰσαρίνδινος, and said to have reigned thirteen years.[1]

[1] Of v. 37 Berosus and Abydenus in *Eusebii chron. arm.* afford some fragmentary confirmations. According to Berosus (*l. c.* p. 19) Sennacherib was murdered by his son Ardumuzanes. In Abyd. (*l. c.* p. 24) Sennacherib was succeeded by Nergilus, whom his son Adrameles murdered, while Adram. again was murdered by his brother Axerdis. Axerdis is said to have pursued his army with mercenary troops to Byzantium, and besides, to have gained possession of Egypt and the interior of Syria. The identity of Axerdis with Aserdan or Esarhaddon is scarcely to be doubted. The notice of Nergilus and his

## CHAPTER XX.

SICKNESS AND RECOVERY OF HEZEKIAH, VV. 1—11. ARRIVAL OF A BABYLONIAN EMBASSY AT JERUSALEM, VV. 12—19. HEZEKIAH'S DEATH, VV. 20, 21.

A parallel account also of the first two events here mentioned, agreeing almost word for word with our text, is found in Is. xxxviii. and xxxix., the relation of which to our own is indicated in the remarks on xviii. 13. But the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness is there followed by his song of thanksgiving after his recovery (Is. xxxviii. 9—20), which is here wanting.

Vv. 1—3. "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death." By בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם the sickness of Hezekiah is placed in the same time with the preceding event, in which case it was certainly still possible, that it occurred shortly after the departure of the Assyrians, as the last verses of the preceding chapter anticipate a later occurrence; but decidedly against this view laid down by Vitr. and Ges. on Is. xxxviii. 1 is the circumstance, that, as

murder by Adrameles appears to be a distortion of the murder of Sennacherib by his son related in our text and confirmed by Berosus. But at the foundation of the account of the conquest of Syria seems to lie the historical fact, that Esarhaddon undertook an expedition against hither Asia, in which he not only brought Babylonian colonists into the depopulated kingdom of the ten tribes, but also by his generals carried away king Manasseh captive to Babylon. (2 Chr. xxxiii. 11.) Against this a chronological difficulty no doubt arises. For if Sennacherib reigned only eighteen years, and attained to the sovereignty in 716 (see on xviii. 13), his successor Esarhaddon would have ascended the throne almost simultaneously with Manasseh, at most one or two years later. But the carrying of Manasseh to Babylon must have taken place at the earliest in the twenty-second year of his reign (comp. on xxi. 15), when Esarhaddon would have been no longer alive, if he had reigned only eight or thirteen years. But this chronological difference can by no means induce us to abandon the connection of the captivity of Manasseh with the said expedition of Esarhaddon to Syria and Palestine, as the statements of Berosus concerning the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon are proved false by the fact that he has made the period from Sennacherib to Nebuchadnezzar twenty years too short. Comp. the remarks on xx. 12.

according to v. 6 fifteen years are to be added to the life of Hezekiah, his sickness must have occurred in the fourteenth year of his reign, since according to xviii. 2 he only reigned twenty-nine years. With this also agrees the farther Divine promise, v. 6, that the Lord would deliver him out of the hand of the king of Assyria. We must therefore with the Rabb. in the *Sed. Ol. rab.*, with Ussher, and the majority of interpreters, place Hezekiah's sickness in the fourteenth year of his reign, or in the beginning of the invasion of Sennacherib, when Jerusalem was first threatened by the enemy. Some earlier and all later expositors take the sickness of the king to be an attack of the plague, and connect it with the destruction of the Assyrian army by the same plague breaking out in the camp. But this connection is disproved by the fact that Hezekiah's sickness falls in the first year of the Assyrian invasion, whereas the destruction of the host took place, according to xix. 19, only in the third year of it. To this is added, that שְׁחִין is nowhere used in the Old Testament of the plague or plague boil, but only either of the ulcers of the leprosy (Job ii. 1, 7, 8) or of other inflammatory ulcers (Ex. ix. 9), and poultices of figs are indeed laid on plague boils by the Arabian physicians, but are equally often, according to the testimony of the ancients as well as universal experience, applied to other ulcers, because the fig διαφορεῖ σκληρίας (Dioscor.) and *ulcera aperit* (Plin.) Comp. the many testimonies on this point collected by Celsius in the *Hierobot.* ii. p. 373. We must therefore think of another disease with an inflammatory ulcer, because not the slightest trace can be discovered in the text of the plague raging at that time in Jerusalem, though the disease cannot be more particularly determined. See the various conjectures about it in Schmidt's bibl. Medicus p. 567 ff.—צַו לְבֵיתֶךָ "give charge concerning thine house," put thy house in order, arrange thy last will (2 Sam. xvii. 33), "for thou shalt die and not live," that is, thy sickness is unto death, namely, without the miraculous aid of God. V. 2. "He turned his face to the wall," not as Ahab (1 Ki. xxi. 4) from displeasure and vexation, but "away from the bystanders to be more collected in prayer" (Gesen.) The Chald. understands קִיר quite erroneously of the wall of the sanctuary.—V. 3. In his prayer Hezekiah appeals to his walk before the Lord

in truth and with a perfect heart, quite in keeping with the legal stand-point of the old covenant. On לֵבָב שָׁלֵם see above p. 132. "And Hezekiah wept sore," not merely because he must die without having an heir to the throne, as Josephus states, but because he was to die in the middle of his life, whereas the Lord had promised long life to the pious.

Vv. 4—7. The prayer of the pious king is immediately heard. Before Isaiah returned to his dwelling, he receives a Divine revelation to return to the king and announce to him, that the Lord will heal him within three days and add fifteen years to his life, that he will also deliver him from the power of the Assyrians and protect Jerusalem, whereupon the prophet returns and causes a lump of figs to be laid on the ulcer, in consequence of which Hezekiah recovered, and at the sametime gives the king at his request a miraculous sign in confirmation of the restoration announced to him.[1] V. 4. וַיְהִי יְשַׁעְיָהוּ וגו "And Isaiah had not yet gone out of the inner city," . . . הָעִיר הַתִּיכֹנָה is the city of David on Mount Zion, or more probably the inner part of the city of David, the royal castle. To this leads the *Keri* חָצֵר הַת׳, which has been erroneously understood of the temple-court; the word עִיר denotes here probably, as in x. 25, the royal castle, so that the *Keri* expressed by all the old versions is a correctly explaining gloss; comp. the remarks on x. 25. V. 25. Instead of שׁוּב stands in Isaiah הָלוֹךְ, and the very suitable designation of Hezekiah as נְגִיד עַמִּי is there omitted. The determination of time added to the words, "I will heal thee," namely, "on the third day thou shalt go to the house of the Lord," ensures to the king the promised recovery. There is no foundation for Hitzig's assertion, that "on the third day" means often a very short space, that is, of several weeks. The

[1] This narrative is abridged in Is. xxxviii. 4—6. In v. 4 the particular determination of the time of granting his prayer, in v. 5 the words, "behold I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go into the house of the Lord," and in v. 6 the words, "for mine own sake and for the sake of my servant David," are omitted. Besides, vv. 7, 8 of our narrative are in Isaiah placed at the close of the chapter, after Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving, which is there inserted (vv. 21, 22), and vv. 8—11, which narrate the miraculous sign, are there considerably abridged in vv. 7, 8.

passage Hos. vi. 2 does not prove this pretended usage, for there it stands, "after two days" and "on the third day." The presumption, that Hezekiah could not have been able actually to go to the temple on the third day, rests partly on the denial of every definite prediction, partly on the erroneous assumption that he was seized by the plague. V. 6. The announcement, also, that the Lord would add fifteen years to his life, we cannot with the rationalists take to be a *vaticinium ex eventu*, because definite statements of time by no means belong to the impossibilities of prophecy. On the second half of v. 6 comp. on xix. 34. —V. 7. דְּבֶלֶת תְּאֵנִים lump of figs, cake of figs, παλάθη, from دبل *in unum coegit idque rotundiori forma.* Comp. on these fig-cakes Faber on Harm.'s Beob. i. p. 389 f. and Ges. *thes.* i. 311. On שְׁחִין see on v. 1. At the close the event of his recovery is immediately appended by וַיֶּחִי. It is possible that the whole verse belongs to the close of this narrative after v. 11, that the prophet first prescribed the means, after he had given the king the miraculous sign recorded in the following verses. Still this assumption is not certain, but it may with equal probability be assumed, that Hezekiah only after the lump of figs was prescribed sought and also received the sign assuring him of the promised recovery.[1]

Vv. 8—11. This sign (אוֹת comp. on xix. 29) consisted in the miraculous return of the shadow on the dial-plate of Ahaz, because Hezekiah, when the choice between the progress or regress of the shadow was granted, as formerly the choice between a sign from the height and a sign from the depth was given to Ahaz, decided for its regress. The phrase מַעֲלוֹת אָחָז "steps of Ahaz," is perhaps scarcely to be understood with the LXX., Syr., and Joseph. (Ant. x. 11, 1), of the steps of stairs or of a stair in the palace of Ahaz, which, as Martini (Abhdl. von den Sonnenuhren der Alten. Lpz. 1777 p. 36 f.), and others assume,

[1] At all events the transposition of those verses in the narrative of Isaiah to the end of the chapter has its grouud in the former assumption, and cannot be set down with Gesen. merely to the account of a transcriber, who may have omitted it in the right place and afterwards appended it. The 21st verse of Isaiah may conveniently stand at the end of the chapter after the song of thanksgiving; the 22d verse only seems to me to have been appended afterwards from our narrative.

was so constructed, that at the same time the shadow of an object, perhaps of an obelisk, falling on it indicated the hours, but denotes probably, as most expositors following the Chald. think, a proper dial-plate, which Ahaz might have received from Babylonia, where sun-dials were invented (Herod. ii. 109), the nature of which, however, as nothing definite can be elicited from the text, must remain undetermined, namely, whether, as R. Elia Chomer in Grotius on the passage thinks, it consisted of a hemispherical cavity in a horizontal square stone, provided with a gnomon or index in the middle, the shadow of which fell on different lines cut in the hollow surface, in the form of the sun-dials, which Vitruvius calls *Hemicyclium*, and the invention of which he ascribes to the Chaldean Berosus[1] *(de archit.* ix. 9 or 8 *edit. Schneid)*, or whether it consisted (Hitz.) merely in a vertical index (γνώμων) surrounded by twelve concentric circles (πόλος), or in an obelisk-like pillar set up in an open elevated place with encircling steps on which the shadow fell (Knobel.) The last view appears, indeed, to correspond most with the words of the text, though מעלות may very well denote merely *degrees*, and in a vertical gnomon we may also speak of the going down and returning of the shadow. The מעלות degrees denoted not whole hours, but much shorter portions of time, as the dial corresponding to the words, "shall the shadow go (forward) ten degrees or go back ten degrees" must have had more than twenty מעלות. Now, with regard to the miracle itself, Lilienthal (d. gute Sache d. Offenb. ix. p. 422 ff.) has satisfactorily proved that the text does not require the assumption of a regression of the sun or a reversion of the rotation of the earth, as the church fathers Ephr. Syr., Jacob of Edessa in Ephr. (*Opp.* i. p. 563), Theod., and many others

[1] Not the celebrated historian but an older mathematician of this name; comp. Martini, Abdhl. v. d. Sonnenuhr. p. 40 ff. There also p. 48 ff. is found a description of the time-pieces invented by Berosus, and drawings of them after some old specimens dug up in Italy. Gesen. (Comm. on Is. i. p. 983) erroneously says, that this kind of sun-dials was called σκαφίς or ἡμισφαίριον, and that Vitruvius ascribes their invention to the Chaldean Berosus. For Vitruvius says *l.c.* *Hemicyclium excavatum ex quadrato ad enclimaque succisum Berosus Chaldaeus dicitur invenisse; Scaphen sive hemisphaerium Aristarchus Samius.* On the nature of the Scaphae invented by Aristarchus comp. Martini i. p. q. p. 98 ff.

believed, but only asserts a miraculous recession of the shadow, in explanation of which, however, we do not need the hypothesis of a rising and sinking, by means of an earthquake, of the body that cast the shadow on the steps, but only the assumption of a miraculous refraction of the sun's rays effected by God at the entreaty of the prophet, for which faint analogies occur in the usual course of nature, as, for example, the phenomenon quoted by all expositors, observed in the year 1703 at Metz in Lothringen, by the prior of the monastery there, P. Romuld and others, namely, that the shadow of a sun-dial went back an hour and a half.[1]

Vv. 12—19. Arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors of Merodach-baladan at Jerusalem, comp. Is. xxxix.—Vv. 12, 13. בָּעֵת הַהִיא "At that time," when Hezekiah was recovered from his sickness. Merodach-baladan[2] is the same as well with the *Μαρδο-*

[1] In our text the regress of the shadow only is mentioned, as in Is. xxxviii 8, at the beginning. When, therefore, it is there said again, "and the sun returned ten steps (degrees)," it is obvious that by a usual metonymy *causa pro effectu*, the sun is named instead of the shadow of the sun's rays falling on the dial. The various opinions concerning this miracle, which has been mythically expounded in a natural way by the rationalists, see in Carpzov. *Appar. crit.* p. 351 ff., Schmidt bibl. Mathem. p. 534 ff., Lilienthal i. p. q. p. 414 ff., in the exeget. Hdb. on the passage, in Gesen. Comm. on Is. xxxviii. 8, and the works there quoted.

[2] So is this Babylonian king called, Is. xxxix. 1, מְרֹאדַךְ בַּלְאֲדָן; in our text, on the contrary, by a frequently occurring change of the labials בְּרֹאדַךְ בַּלְאֲדָן. In Jer l. 2 מְרֹדָךְ occurs along with *Bel* as the name of a Babylonian idol, probably Mars (comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 818), as in general among the Assyrians and Babylonians the names of the gods are often found repeated in the names of kings and nobles; comp. Ges. Comm. on Is. i. p. 281. At all events P. v. Bohlen's explanation is to be rejected, according to which מראדך = مردك *merdek homunculus*, and בלאדן = بلادن *i.e. homo laudatus.* Comp. on the contrary Kleinert in the Dörpt'schen Beiträgen i. p. 214 ff.—Gesen. *thes.* ii. 818 wishes to derive מראדך *a stirpe Mord, Mort, quae et mortem et caedem significat.* בלאדן he takes, *l.c.* i. 226, to be contracted from בעל אדן, *cui Bel est dominus*, according to which the Greek name Μαρδοκέμπαδος may, with Kleinert *l.c.* p. 218, be explained from מרדך נבו אדן *cui Nebo est dominus.*

κέμπαδος in the can. of Ptol., as with the Merudach Baldanes of Beros. in Polyh. in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 19, and reigned accord- to Ptol. twelve years, 721—709, in Babylon According to Polyh. after the murder of *Hagises* (or *Acises*) he assumed to be independent sovereign of Babylonia; but was, after six months, slain by *Elibus*; but the latter again, in the third year of his reign, was subdued by Sennacherib and carried to Assyria, whereupon Sennacherib appointed his son Asordan (Esarhaddon) king of Babylon.[1] The כִּי שָׁמַע of our text for וַיִּשְׁמַע

[1] The identity of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus is pretty generally acknowledged in modern times, whereas its identity with the Marudach Baldanes of Berosus has been denied by Winer (R.W. i. p. 123 and 256 f. ii. p. 100) and Hitzig on Is. xxxix. 1 on chronological grounds, while Knobel on Is. xxxix. 1 maintains the latter and disputes the former. Knobel rightly maintains for his opinion the full agreement of the names (in Beros. and the biblical text); but when he attempts to prove from Is. xxix. 2, comp. with 2 Ki. xviii. 15 f., and 2 Chr. xxxii. 25—31, that the arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors at Jerusalem falls in the year 703, in which, according to Berosus, Merodach-baladan reigned, whereas Mardocempadus was king from 721—709, the untenableness of this argument is easily shown. The verses quoted from Chronicles contain a summary of that which was to be communicated concerning Hezekiah, from which, however, it does not follow that the acts of this king here brought together were all performed in the interval between his sickness and the arrival of the Babylonian embassy. The circumstance also that Hezekiah showed the ambassadors his whole treasury, the silver and gold, the spicery and the precious oil, his whole armoury, and all that was found in his treasures (v. 13 and Is. xxxix. 2), does not imply that he must have been in possession of greater treasures and power than he could have had in a year or two after the departure of Sennacherib; comp. our remarks on v. 13. But the arrival of the Babylonian ambassadors must not for this reason be placed ten years after Hezekiah's sickness, because they assigned as the ostensible object of their mission to congratulate the king on his recovery (v. 12), and at the same time to enquire concerning the miracle of the recession of the shadow on the sun-dial of Ahaz (2 Chr. xxxii. 31), an object which they could not pretend to have ten years after the event. To reject with Knobel this historical statement as unhistorical is uncritical caprice. As the Babylonian ambassadors had besides this ostensible object a still weightier one, in fact, according to universal and undoubtedly correct conjecture, to form an alliance with Hezekiah, or at least to seek his friendship in order to gain in him if possible a support against the Assyrians, we may certainly place their arrival not before the departure of Sennacherib, but also not long after it, and we believe we shall not be far astray, if we place it in the year 710, when Merodach-baladan, after the annihi-

in Isaiah is at all events clearer, although the reading of Isaiah may be original: on the contrary the חִזְקִיָּהוּ of our text appears

lation of the best part of the Assyrian army, had the fairest opportunity of revolting, as he intended, from Assyria, and obviously with this design sought the friendship of Hezekiah. Now, as according to the canon of Ptol., Mardocempadus was at this time still alive, there is nothing on this side to hinder the identification of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus; but with regard to the chronological difference, on account of which Hitz. and Win. take the Merudach B., mentioned by Beros., to be different from our Merodach-baladan, Hitz. especially urges, that in Polyh. Merodach B. was slain by Elibus after a reign of scarcely six months, and against the latter again in the third year of his reign, Sennacherib took the field, slew him, and appointed his own son king of Babylon: but that Elibus is unquestionably the Belibus, whose reign the canon likewise states at three years, and dates from the 45th year after Nabonassar, that is, from the year 703.—Here there is certainly a difference between the canon of Ptol. and Polyh., while the identity of Elibus in Ptol., with the Belibus of Polyh., even if probable, is by no means certain. To this is added, that the canon knows nothing of an Asordan as regent of Babylon at this time, and thus at all events a difference between it and Polyhistor remains, which cannot with Hitzig be obviated by the assumption, that Asordan is concealed in the Apranadius of the canon, for to Asordan corresponds in the canon Asaradinus, who reigned from 680—667. We must therefore either assume, that Berosus passed over several sovereigns (Ges.). or that Polyh. has inaccurately extracted Beros. (Win. R.W. i. p. 258) and need not on account of this difference surrender the identity of Merodach-baladan with Mardocempadus. But Winer has urged another chronological difference. "Through Beros.," says he i. p. 256, "we reach with Merodach-baladan at the farthest to 697 B.C., whereas the canon of Ptol. places the beginning of his reign in 721 B.C., which comes nearer to the biblical accounts." This remark is founded on the circumstance, that the four sovereigns already enumerated on xv. 19, from Berosus (Sennacherib, his son Asordan, Sammughes, and his brother Sardanapalus) reigned altogether only sixty-eight years, according to which, if Nabopolassar, who succeeded Sardanapalus, attained to the sovereignty in 625 B.C., Sennacherib would have ascended the throne sixty-eight years earlier, that is, in 693, or if we assume for Asordan instead of eight, according to the canon of Ptol. and Syncellus thirteen years, in 698, whereas he must have become king about 716 B.C. The difference between Berosus, on the one hand, and the biblical accounts and the canon of Pt. on the other, has been long known and variously expounded. In my apol. Vers. p. 429 ff., I have shown that we cannot reconcile it either with Niebuhr (Kl. hist. u. philol. Schr. 1 Samml. p. 209) by shortening the fifty-five years' reign of Manasseh to thirty-five, or with Hitzig (Begr. d. Krit. p. 197 f.) by the gratuitous introduction of a king with a reign of twenty-one years between Sammughes and Sardanapalus in Berosus, but that the deficient years in Berosus must be attributed to his statements concerning the reigns

more original than ויחזקח in Isaiah, inasmuch as the reflection that the ambassadors might congratulate the king, not certainly on his sickness, but only on his recovery, might lead the redactor of Isaiah to change the words, "that Hezekiah had been sick" into "that he had been sick and was recovered."—V. 13. The וַיִּשְׁמַע also of our text has the presumption of originality in preference to the וַיִּשְׂמַח of Isaiah. "When Hezekiah had hearkened to

of Esarhaddon and Sennacherib. Subsequently Hävernick (Einl. ii. 1, p. 224) endeavoured to account for the difference by adopting the conclusions of Hofmann (die siebenzig yahre des Jer. 1836, p. 30 ff.), who by a comparison of the sovereigns from Asaradan to Nabonadius according to the received canon of Ptolemy, according to the astronomical one of Syncellus, and according to the ecclesiastical one of Syncellus, endeavoured to prove, that Esarhaddon reigned not eight or thirteen, but rather thirty-two years, and his two successors Saosduchin and Kyniladan not twenty and twenty-two = forty-two years, as the received canon states, but only nine and fourteen, that is, altogether twenty-three years, and that the numbers twenty and twenty-two were only transferred from the series of Assyrian sovereigns in *Euseb. chronic.* to that of the Babylonian kings, and the nineteen years deducted from these sovereigns in the canon were assigned to the reign of Asaradan. But Hävern. has allowed himself to be deceived by the extremely bold as well as arbitrary combinations of Hofmann, as he has altogether overlooked the fact, that they were designed for quite a different object, namely, to furnish the proof, that Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar 605 B.C., and Nebuchadnezzar, as he destroyed this city according to Jer. lii. 29, in the 18th year of his reign (?), reigned from 623—580 B.C. For this purpose Hofm. rejected as well the chronological statements of Polyh. as those of the canon of Ptol., and arrived at the given result, which can by no means be brought into harmony with the biblical chronology. For according to the Books of Kings and Chronicles, there are from the death of Hezekiah to the destruction of Jerusalem 110 years and six months (namely fifty-five years of Manasseh, two of Amon, thirty-one of Josiah, three months of Jehoahaz, eleven years of Jehoiakim, three months of Jehoiachin, and eleven years of Zedekiah); on the contrary, Hofm. puts for Asaradan thirty-two years, for Saosduchin nine, for Kyniladan fourteen, for Nabopolassar twenty-one, and for Nebuchadnezzar eighteen, that is, altogether ninety-eight years, so that Asaradan (Esarhaddon) would have ascended the throne sixteen and a half years after Manasseh, and the death of Sennacherib could not possibly be, as Häv. with Niebuhr assumes, almost contemporary with that of Hezekiah. But Hofmann's arrangement is in decided contradiction not only with the Bible, but also with the canon of Ptol.; for according to the latter Nabapolassar reigned from 625—604, and Nebuchadnezzar from 604—561; according to Hofm. the former should have reigned from 644—623, the latter from 623—580.

them," that is, to their congratulations and their business. The וישמח of Isaiah preferred by the modern expositors is nothing but a critically objectionable change. בֵּית נְכֹתֹה "his treasure-house" (Chald., Syr., and Saad.) נְכֹת is not connected with נכאת *spice* (Gen. xxxvii. 25), as Ges. *thes.* ii. 883, following Aquila, Symon., and the Vulg., assumes, but comes from the unused root כּוּת (comp. كَيَّتَ *farsit, implevit loculum)* and signifies properly *that which is laid up*, the treasure, as צָפוּן Job xx. 26; comp. Hitz. and Knob. on Is. xxxix. 2, and Fürst, *Concord.* p. 551. בֵּית כֵּלָיו his armoury, arsenal. בְּכָל־מֶמְשַׁלְתּוֹ in his whole dominion, that is, in every department of it, which he could command as his own. As Hezekiah, in 714 B.C., gave Sennacherib (xviii. 15) all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord and in the treasures of the king's house, it might seem strange that only four years later, not long after the departure of the Assyrians, he should have again collected great treasures of gold and silver. But let us remember that it is not here said that his treasure house was filled with gold and silver, but only that he showed the gold and silver therein along with the other treasures and precious things. But with whatever reason it may be doubted that Hezekiah, after the payment of tribute made to Sennacherib, could have already again collected much treasure even in gold and silver, yet it is expressly observed in 2 Chr. xxxii. 23, that after Sennacherib's overthrow, many brought presents to Hezekiah from respect to him who by his steadfast confidence in the Lord, and by his prayer, had saved the country. Besides, it is not quite so improbable, that, as Vitringa and others have hinted, Sennacherib, in his hasty flight with the remnant of his army that was not slain by the destroying angel, might have left many valuable things in his camp, which as booty came into the royal treasury of Hezekiah.

Vv. 14—19. Hezekiah showed the Babylonian ambassadors all his treasures and precious things, because he obviously felt his vanity flattered by their arrival, as may be discovered from the answer he gave the prophet, from a far country, from Babylon are they come. Isaiah therefore announces the word of the Lord, that hereafter all his treasures would be carried away to

Babylon, and some even of his sons would be made courtiers in the palace of the king at Babylon. The sin of vanity is to be punished with the withdrawal of that of which the heart is proud. Moreover this prediction has not proceeded merely from the prophetic custom to threaten destruction directly from that people with whom the treaty was intended to be made. For this "prophetic custom," asserted by the rationalists, rests itself on a deeper Divine law lying in the nature of the theocracy, namely, that God the Lord punishes man by that wherein he has sinned; and this sentence of the prophet is no mere menace of human device, but a prediction inspired by the Spirit of God, which was also literally carried into effect by Nebuchadnezzar. יֻקַּח, "one will take" (v. 18), is to to be preferred as the more difficult reading to the יִקָּחוּ of Isaiah, which stands here also in the margin as *Keri*. The words, "of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget," denote not necessarily the sons of his body, but in general the descendants of his body, so that from these words alone nothing certain can be drawn as to the time when the punishment denounced would be carried into execution. סָרִיסִים *ennuchi* stands here as often *sensu latiori* for courtiers, court-officers in general, as for example Daniel and his companions were (Dan. i. 8), without being castrated. V. 19. The answer of Hezekiah, "Good is the word of the Lord, which thou hast spoken. And he said, Well, may only peace and truth be in my days," Gesen., Hitz., Knob., and others, take to be an expression of that easy egotism, which is little affected by the fate of others. But, on the contrary, the author of the exeg. Hdb. has remarked: "Such a sentiment does not suit Hezekiah." The older expositors (Vitringa, J. H. Mich., and others) found in it the utterance of an humble acknowledgment of the righteousness and mercy of God. *Hiskias erroris monitus et sentiens se divinam indignationem in se juste provocasse, agnovit culpam et se coram Deo profunde humiliavit* (Vitr.) "Good is the word of the Lord," means, I am content with that which the Lord has determined, I resign myself to his will (comp. 1 Ki. ii. 38—42.)[1]

[1] *Bonum vocatur id in quo acquiescere par est, quippe ab eo profectum, qui nihil facit, quod non sit non tantum justissimum sed quod summa bonitate non sit temperatum, etiam cum poenas sumit.* Cleric.

*Acquiescit in decreto divinae justitiae sibi a propheta denunciato — — persuasus omne verbum Dei et rigidiores etiam sententias decretorum ejus esse aequas, justas et bene meritas* (Vitr.) And with regard to the other statement of the king, "Well, may only etc.," the same excellent scholar remarks: *laudat decreti divini temperamentum, quod cum Deus pro rationibus justitiae suae se ipsum huic calamitati potuisset objicere, sibi tamen pro clementia sua voluerit parcere et malum transferre in posteritatem.* Comp. 1 Ki. xx. 29.—אֱמֶת is not *status rerum stabilis* (Vitr.), continuance (Gesen., Umbr.), security (Knob.), but *fides*, fidelity, though not human fidelity, "which keeps peace, observes the tacit covenant" (Hitz.), but the fidelity of God, which keeps the promised grace for the humble. The sense is, may the Lord not withdraw from me his peace and his fidelity during my life. —The second וַיֹּאמֶר shows, that Hezekiah uttered the last words after a short pause, and no longer directly to Isaiah. For הֲלוֹא אִם stands in Is. v. 8 כִּי truly, *profecto*, not *quod* (Win. *lex.* p. 473.) הֲלוֹא *nonne* has often the affirmative sense, yes, well, comp. Gesen. Lehrg. p. 834. אִם is here an optative particle, as Ps. lxxxi. 9.

Vv. 20, 21. End of the reign of Hezekiah. בְּרֵכָה is the pond formed between the two city walls, and תְּעָלָה the aqueduct, by which the water of the upper Gihon was conveyed into this ברכה, and from it again into the city, see on xviii. 17.— With v. 21 comp. 2 Chr. xxxii. 33.

## CHAPTER XXI.

REIGN OF MANASSEH, VV. 1—18, COMP. 2 CHR. XXXIII. 1—20; AND OF AMON VV. 19—26; COMP. 2 CHR. XXXIII. 21—25.

V. 1. "Manasseh was twelve years old when he became king." He was therefore born after that mortal sickness of Hezekiah, and ascended the throne very young, by which it is

in a great measure explained, that he inherited only the throne of his father, and not also the theocratic principles of his reign.

Vv. 2—9. Manasseh, as sovereign, pursued the path of his grandfather, Ahaz, promoted idolatry like him, and went even farther in order to fill up the measure of iniquity, so that under his long reign idolatry attained to a hitherto unknown height, and drew inevitably after it the sentence of Judah's rejection (comp. xxiii. 26.) This relapse into idolatry, which Hezekiah had endeavoured to eradicate with all zeal, can only be explained by this, that the reform of Hezekiah had wrought in the people only an external conversion to the legal worship of Jehovah, no real change of mind or heart; as we may infer with certainty from the predictions of Isaiah under Hezekiah, especially from chap. xxviii.—xxxii. The powerful ungodly party of the people, at the head of which stood the leaders of the people, the priests and prophets, who reeled through strong drink, were over-mastered by wine, who reeled in prophesying, stumbled in judgment, (Is. xxviii. 7, 14 ff.), who also sought help against the Assyrians in Egypt and its power instead of Jehovah, the rebellious people, the lying children, who would not hear the law, who said to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us true things, speak to us smooth things, prophesy deceit, get you out of the way, turn aside out of the path, remove from our sight the Holy One of Israel (Is. xxx. 9—11), and all the hypocrites who honoured the Lord only with the mouth and the lips, but were estranged from him in heart, and whose fear of God consisted in the learning of human precepts (Is. xxix. 13), were not altogether extirpated by the Assyrians and with them from the theocracy, but were still to be exterminated by farther punishments (Is. xxix. 14 ff.) This antitheocratic party of the people had certainly encreased in power and extent during the latter flourishing years of Hezekiah, so that after his death, while Manasseh was still a minor, it gained the superiority, assumed the guidance of the young inexperienced king, and seduced him to the open introduction of idolatry. Seb. Schm. has very justly remarked; *Quamquam Hiskias rex fuit piissimus, tamen inter ministros ejus necdum subditos erant multi insignes hypocritae et idololatrae, inter quos Magister domus Jes. 22 expresse indicatur.*—V. 2, comp. on viii. 18, and xvi. 3.—V. 3. וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּבֶן "he built again

the high places," etc. comp. xvii. 4, and 1 Ki. xvi. 31—33. "He worshipped all the host of heaven." The worship of all the host of heaven first introduced in the times of the Assyrians is obviously of upper Asiatic, Chaldaic, and Assyrian origin. This worship "was not idolatry, as the Israelito-Phenician, but pure star-worship" (comp. Mov. d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 66.) The sun had, as among the Persians, sacred chariots and horses (xxiii. 11), and incense was offered to the stars (xxi. 4, xxiii. 12; 2 Chr. xxxiii. 5; Jer. xix. 13; and Zeph. i. 5) on the house-tops, as among the Nabataeans (Strabo *l.* xvi. 4, p. 441), or in the temple area, in the two courts, under the open sky, with the face turned towards the sun-rise (Ezek. viii. 16),[1] and indeed not merely to the sun and moon, but also to the signs of the zodiac and the whole host of heaven, that is, all the constellations (xxiii. 5); which is to be so understood, that the sun, moon, planets, and the other stars, in conjunction with the zodiac, were worshipped (Mov. i. p. 164), wherewith astrology, the interpretation of the stars and the calculation of nativities, as we find them among the later so-called Chaldeans, are closely connected.[2]

[1] The far-spread assertion, that the star-worshippers therein like the Magi held the holy branch Barsom at the nose (comp. Mov. i. p. 66, de Wette, Archaeol. p. 325), cannot be proved from Ezek. viii. 17. Comp. Häv. Comm. on Ezek. p. 117 ff.

[2] Movers, Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 65, justly remarks, "In all the books of the Old Testament which are written before the Assyrian period, no trace of star-worship is to be found; not as if the Phenician (Canaanitish) gods had not also a sidereal signification, but because this element was subordinate, and the expressions sun, moon, stars, and all the host of heaven, which did not occur before, become now very frequent." But when this scholar cites in proof of this, besides the passages already quoted by us in the text, Deut. iv. 19 and xvii. 3, with the design of proving that Deuteronomy is certainly Mosaic in spirit and essential form, but in its present condition belongs to the Assyrian period, we cannot assent to this assertion borrowed from rationalistic criticism, as it is not proved, and reject it the more unhesitatingly, as Movers himself afterwards (p. 157 ff.) distinguishes a threefold aspect of the adoration of the stars, (*a*) the pure star-worship of the Magi, which tolerates no image of the deity, and worships the stars by contemplation under the open heaven or on the house tops (comp. Job. xxxi. 26 f.); (*b*) the Syrophenician star-worship, which regards the stars as the authors of all becoming and perishing in nature, and makes the sun an idol, image, and bearer of the male power of nature, which is then associated with the moon as the female power of nature; (*c*) the

Vv. 4 and 5 go together forming one period. The וּבָנָה מִזְבְּחֹת (v. 4) is taken up again (v. 5) by וַיִּבֶן מִזב׳, and the בְּבֵית יְהוָה (v. 4) more exactly defined by (v. 5) בִּשְׁתֵּי חַצְרוֹת ב׳ יה׳. The two courts of the house of the Lord are the court of the priests and the great court of the people. The temple of Solomon had no more courts, comp. my treatise, d. Tempel Salomo's p. 112.—V. 6. Comp. on xvi. 3. עוֹנֵן *denom.* from עָנָן, properly to be employed about the clouds, to predict from the clouds. So here and Lev. xix. 26; Deut. xviii. 10, where it is connected with נִחֵשׁ; then again in the farther sense, *augurari*, for example Is. ii. 6; Jer. xxvii. 9; Mic. v. 11. Other divisions and explanations of the words see in *Carpz. Appar. crit.* p. 540 f. and Ges. *thes.* ii. 1053.—As to נִחֵשׁ see on xvii. 17.—"He prepared necromancers and cunning men." אוֹב not from اب *rediit* = le révenant, the ghost (Millius, Simonis, Hitz. on Is. viii. 19 and others), but from אב = אבב *cavum esse*, whence the Aram. אֲבוּב *tibia, fistula propter cavitatem*, means (*a*) *uter*, the leather bag (Job xxxii. 19), (*b*) *venter pythonis, qui obsessus instar utris inflati turgescit, ex quo spiritus immundus de futuris interrogatus respondet. Deinde partim de ipso* daemone *ventriloquo, partim de ipso* pythone, *necromanti et hariolo.* Fürst *Con-*

view which, flowing from the immutability of the stars in opposition to the mutability of all earthly things, worships the stars not only as the authors of all becoming, and perishing, but at the same time as the disposers and rulers of all sublunary things, and produced the astrology of the Chaldeans and in later times Zabaism. The distinction of these three views, which Movers calls the upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, the Syrophenician and the Chaldaeo-Babylonian, is founded in fact, but not, as Movers seems to think, as if one of these three views was always peculiar to one of the nations named, of which historical proofs are wanting, but so that we may regard the first and third as two successive steps of development, and oppose the two together to the form of star-worship cultivated among the Syrians and Phenicians. But the first form of pure star-worship existed in Chaldea and Arabia from the oldest historically known times, and against this kind of star-worship warning is given in the passages quoted from Deuteronomy, not against that introduced into Judea by Ahaz and Manasseh after the Assyrian period, which was connected with astrology. The farther proofs, also, which Movers p. 66, 67, adduces for the diversity of the Assyrian star-worship from the Phenician and Babylonian image-worship, are quite untenable.

*cord.* p. 21. The Rabb. explained it by פִּיתוֹם, that is *πύθων;* LXX. ἐγγαστρίμυθος. Other explanations see in Ges. *thes.* i. 35 and Win. *lex.* p. 26 f. Here it signifies the necromancer. יִדְּעֹנִי, which occurs only in connection with אוֹב, properly *sapiens,* denotes (*a*) the soothsaying spirit, Lev. xx. 27, *πνεῦμα πύθωνος,* Acts xvi. 16, (*b*) the soothsayer, 1 Sam. xxviii. 3 and 9; Is. viii. 19, etc.—V. 7. The image of Asherah, which he had made (v. 3), Manasseh set up in the very temple, which, according to the express declaration of the Lord, was to be the dwelling-place of his name (2 Sam. vii. 13; 1 Ki. ix. 3; 2 Chr. vii. 16 comp. with 1 Ki. vii. 16.) On לְעוֹלָם see above p. 121 f.—The words, "Neither will I make the foot of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers" (v. 8), refer to the promise 2 Sam. vii. 10, "I will appoint a place for my people . . . that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more," which was fulfilled by the selection of the temple for the abode of his name, see above p. 71. הֵנִיד *vagari fecit, expulit.* Concerning the condition, "only if they will observe to do," etc., comp. the remarks p. 123 f.—V. 9. But this condition Israel did not keep. Manasseh seduced them to do more evil than the Canaanites, whom the Lord had destroyed before them.

Vv. 10—15. The Lord also by his prophets warned Manasseh and the people that were seduced into sin by him, and threatened them with the fearful sentence of the destruction of Jerusalem and the surrender of the remnant of his people into the power of their enemies; but they did not hearken, as is expressly mentioned 2 Chr. xxxiii. 10, and in our narrative may be inferred from this, that it never speaks of a trace of repentance. The prophets who warned Manasseh are not named; Habakkuk probably belonged to them;[1] but their addresses were recorded in

[1] It is still disputed, indeed, whether Habakkuk delivered his predictions that are found in the canon in the time of Manasseh or in the first half of the reign of Josiah; but the sole ground which, according to Delitsch (d. Proph. Hab. p. xvii.), can be alleged against placing Habakkuk under Manasseh, namely, that the work of the Divine judgment to be executed on Judah by the Chaldeans is to be accomplished in the days of those to whom the message is addressed (בִּימֵיכֶם Hab. i. 5), does not appear to me to be absolutely cogent, as the passage Joel i. 2 is not quite adequate to prove, that in the expression, "in

the annals of the kingdom of Judah (2 Chr. xxxiii. 18.)—V. 11. הָאֱמֹרִי the Amorites are mentioned here, as 1 Ki. xxi. 26 and Ezek. xvi. 3, *instar omnium* as the supporters of Canaanitish ungodliness. Concerning גִּלֻּלִים see on xvii. 17.—The phrase, "that whosoever heareth it both his ears shall tingle," (v. 12), denotes an unheard of event causing horror and amazement, comp. 1 Sam. iii. 11; Jer. xix. 3. Habakkuk also (i. 5), announces the Chaldean judgment as a work of the Lord creating astonishment and exceeding belief.—V. 13. "I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab." The line (קָו) and the plummet (מִשְׁקֹלֶת the level) was applied to that which was built (Zech. i. 16), but also to that which was to be levelled with the ground, utterly razed (Am. vii. 7.) Even prisoners were measured off with the line (חֶבֶל) in order to be slain or pardoned (2 Sam. viii. 2). Hence arose the expressions, "line of desolation, plummet of emptiness," Is. xxxiv 11. The line of Samaria accordingly means the line which is drawn for destruction over Samaria, the plummet of the house of Ahab, the extirpation which befell the house of Ahab. The sense therefore is, I will destroy Jerusalem as I destroyed Samaria, and exterminate its inhabitants, as I exterminated the house of Ahab. The following figure, "I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth the dish, who wipes it and turns it upside down," denotes still more strongly the complete extirpation of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem together with its total destruction. V. 14. "And I will forsake the remnant of mine inheritance," that is, the people of the kingdom of Judah alone remaining of all the peculiar people of the Lord. Concerning נֶפֶשׁ see above p. 132. The necessary consequence of the Lord's forsaking his people or withdrawing his grace from them,

your days," the life-time of the sons, who were partly born, partly to be born to the generation then arrived at manhood, must have been excluded. On the other hand, it must also be admitted, that the grounds for this view advanced by Häv. (Einl. ii. 2, p. 387 ff.) do not compel assent. Moreover, we may very fairly assume that Habakkuk delivered predictions under Manasseh concerning this sovereign and his ungodliness, and yet his predictions transmitted to us in the canon belonged to the times of Josiah.

is the delivery of them into the hand of their enemies, that they may become a prey and a spoil to them. בַּז and מְשִׁסָּה occur together also, Is. xlii. 22, and Jer. xxx. 16.[1]

[1] While hitherto Chronicles agrees with our narrative in the description of the idolatrous conduct of Manasseh, henceforth deviating from it, it relates farther (2 Chr. xxx. 11—17), that Jehovah brought the generals of the king of Assyria against Manasseh, who bound him with chains and carried him to Babylon. But when in his affliction he besought the Lord, the Lord brought him again to Jerusalem to his throne, whereupon he raised a second high wall on the west side of the city, and put garrisons in all the fenced cities of Judah, removed the strange gods and the idol from the temple, and cast out of the city all the altars of idols built on the mount of the temple and in Jerusalem, repaired the altar of Jehovah, sacrificed thereon peace-offerings and thank-offerings, and commanded the people to serve the God of Israel; but the people still sacrificed on the high places, though to Jehovah their God. This account appears, on a superficial examination, so little in accordance with the narrative of our book concerning Manasseh and the extirpation of his idolatry, effected only under Josiah (chap. xxiii.), that it cannot surprise us, that not merely Rosenm. bibl. Althk. i. 2, p. 131 f., Winer (R.W. ii. p. 63), Hitzig (Begr. d. krit. p. 180 f.), and others following Gramberg, have rejected it as unhistorical, but also Mov. (Krit. Unters. v. 327, ff.) has abandoned the narrative of Manasseh's repentance as a traditional invention of a religious didactic tendency, and only endeavoured to maintain the fact of the carrying away of Manasseh to Babylon as a historical event, whereas the *whole* narrative has been very ably defended by Hävern. (Einl. ii. 1, p. 221 ff.) Thus much is antecedently certain, and is acknowledged even by Mov. himself notwithstanding his erroneous view of the sources of Chronicles, that the silence of our narrative as to these events concerning Manasseh can afford no reason for their rejection. For as our author often contents himself with a general account of the sovereigns, and is silent about such of their doings as exercised no important influence on the development of the theocracy, he might here also omit the captivity of Manasseh and his reformation after his return from Babylon, if it put no effectual hindrance to the corruption which he had introduced into the kingdom by his idolatry. In favour of the historical truth of Manasseh's removal to Babylon is (*a*) the circumstance, that no reason can be imagined for the invention of such a fact, inasmuch as neither his removal nor his release and return had lasting effects on the kingdom of Judah; (*b*) the agreement of this account with that which is remarked on xix. 37, concerning Esarhaddon's expedition against hither Asia and especially to Palestine. As shortly before the king of Babylon, Merodach-baladan, is mentioned as a sovereign independent of Assyria, the later unhistorical legend would certainly have made Manasseh be carried away either by Assyrian generals to Nineveh, or if, according to Hitzig's conjecture, it was copied after Is. xxxix. 6, by Babylonian generals to Babylon, but not by

Vv. 16—18. Besides his idolatry, to which he seduced his subjects, Manasseh sinned very grievously in this, that he shed so much innocent blood, that Jerusalem was filled with it from one end to the other. This statement Josephus (Ant. x. 3, 1), has thus paraphrased: Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καταφρονήσεως ὁρμώμενος, πάντας ὁμῶς τοὺς δικαίους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἀπέκτεινεν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τῶν προφητῶν ἔσχε φειδώ· καὶ τούτων δέ τινας καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀπέσφαξεν, ὥστε αἵματι ῥεῖσθαι τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα.[1] V. 18. "He was buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza," thus in a separate family sepulchre probably on Zion (comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 189), in which also his son Amon was interred (v. 26.) This royal garden bore the name, Uzzah's garden, probably from its former owner, but by no means from the place, *ubi Usa occisus est*, 2 Sam. vi. 8, as C. a Lap. and Calm. think. The name Uzza (עֻזָּא) occurs also elsewhere, for example 1 Chr. viii. 7; Ezr. ii. 49; Neh. vii. 51.

*Assyrian* generals to *Babylon*, as the later Jews, it is well known, were not so conversant with the ancient history of the Asiatic kingdoms, as to know that the territory of Babylon, having become independent of Assyria in the time of Hezekiah, was again, under Manasseh, an Assyrian province.—Concerning the time of the deportation of Manasseh to Babylon, which no doubt coincides with the expedition of Esarhaddon against hither Asia, in which the heathen colonists were brought to Samaria, as historical documents here fail, the prediction, Is. vii. 8, "that within sixty-five years Ephraim should be no more a people," furnishes a hint, inasmuch as the ceasing of Israel to be a people, was determined by the settlement of the heathen colonists in Samaria. But this point of time named by Isaiah is the twenty-third or twenty-fourth year of Manasseh's reign, in which the Rabbins in the *Sed. Ol.* p. 67 ed. Meyer, likewise Ussher (Annal. ad. a. M. 3327), and *des Vign. chronol.* i. p. 428 f. had fixed his captivity, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 428.—But of the duration of his exile there is no historical trace. Though from the fact that his reign is represented in the Old Testament as uninterrupted, we may perhaps conclude that he very soon received his freedom again, by a circumstance totally unknown to us. Hävern. indeed i. p. q., thinks with Hoffman, that his release unquestionably took place after Esarhaddon's death, but this "unquestionably" may very easily be questioned.

[1] There is also a well-known tradition among Jews and Christians, that Manasseh put to death the prophet Isaiah, and indeed caused him to be sawn asunder, to which very probably allusion is made in Heb. xi. 37 (comp. Gesen. Comm. on Is. i. p. 9 ff., and Bleek, d. Brief a. d. Hebr. ii. 2, p. 832 ff.), but which, as Gesen. i. p. q. and Häv. Einl. ii. 2, p. 57 certainly conjecture with right, was perhaps formed only on the foundation of our verse by the Hagadah of Judaism.

Vv. 19—26. Reign of Amon. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiii. 21—25. Amon walked in all the way of his father Manasseh, serving all the idols his father had introduced, and was murdered in the second year of his reign by his servants, who had conspired against him, whereupon the people, however, slew all the conspirators and placed his son Josiah on the throne. Concerning Amon, Seb. Schm. remarks: *Hic rex Amon praeter impietatem notatu dignum nihil fecit.*—V. 19. The place יָטְבָה Jotbah, from which Amon's mother came, was, according to Hieron. (*s. v. Jethaba*) *urbs antiqua Judaeae*, but it is no farther known. Joseph. (Ant. x. 3, 2) writes it Ἰαβάτη, and Grotius identifies it with יָטְבָתָה, one of the Israelitish stations in the wilderness of Arabia, comp. Num. xxxiii; Deut. x. 7.

---

## CHAPTER XXII.—XXIII. 30.

REIGN OF KING JOSIAH, VV. 1, 2; DISCOVERY OF THE BOOK OF THE LAW ON THE OCCASION OF REPAIRING THE TEMPLE, VV. 3—20; READING OF THE LAW IN THE TEMPLE AND RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT WITH THE LORD, CH. XXIII. 1—3; ABOLITION OF IDOLATRY AND SOLEMNIZATION OF THE PASSOVER, VV. 4—24; END OF JOSIAH'S REIGN, VV. 25—30.

Vv. 1, 2. Duration and spirit of the reign of Josiah. His mother Jedidah was the daughter of Adaiah of Boscath (בָּצְקַת), a town no farther known in the plain of Judah, comp. Jos. xv. 39. Josiah again walked like Hezekiah in the footsteps of his ancestor David, adhering undeviatingly to the law of the Lord. He had probably, as his ungodly father had died early, on his ascending the throne a child of eight years, come under the guidance of pious men truly devoted to the law of the Lord, who turned him to the God of his fathers, inasmuch as his rule was so theocratically righteous. The phrase, "turned not aside to the right or to the left," namely, from that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, is a description of undeviating adherence

to the commandments of the Lord borrowed from Deut. (comp. v. 29, xvii. 11, 20, xxviii. 14.)

V. 3 ff. The following narrative from v. 3 to ch. xxiii. 24 forms a closely connected section, in which all that Josiah did for the resuscitation of the true worship of Jehovah and the extirpation of idolatry during his reign is united into one grand scene, and the whole reform accomplished by this pious king is referred to the eighteenth year of his reign, because in this year the discovery of the Mosaic book of the law took place, by means of which the complete reformation of religion could be undertaken, and was actually carried into effect. How closely all the several events and undertakings of Josiah presented to the reader in this collective picture are connected together, the narrator himself indicates by placing the date, "it came to pass in the eighteenth year of Josiah," not merely at the opening, but also repeating it at the close of this section. But if we consider all the particular incidents that are brought before us in this section, the repair of the temple, the discovery of the book of the law made on this occasion, the reading of it before the king, the consulting of the prophetess Huldah, the summoning of the elders of Judah, and the solemn reading of the law in the temple along with the renewal of the covenant, the extirpation of idolatry, not only in Jerusalem and all Judah, but also in Bethel and all the cities of Samaria, finally, the arrangement and solemnization of the passover, it will appear of itself that they could not all be completed within a year, even if we should with Ussher (*Annal ad a.m.* 3381) delay the solemn festival of the passover to the end of the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign. But this delay of the passover is quite an unnecessary expedient, as, notwithstanding de Wette's protest against it (Einl. p. 257), it is established, that the years of the reign were always computed from Nisan (see above p. 184), so that the passover fell in the first month of the eighteenth year (xxiii. 23); whereas the date placed at the head of the section, "it came to pass in the eighteenth year" (xxii. 3), can decide nothing, because it is to be regarded as a superscription, and proves merely this, that the narrator comprehended the efforts of Josiah for the restoration of the legal worship of Jehovah, which were contignous in point of time, and occupied a space of several years, according to the

order of nature under one general point of view. Hence alone it is explained that the account of the repairs of the temple is only inserted in vv. 3—5, and compressed into a single antecedent sentence, which presents the occasion for the discovery of the law. For the apodosis to וַיְהִי בִּשְׁמֹנֶה וגו (v. 3) follows only in v. 8, and the period is to be thus construed in plain English: "It came to pass in the eighteenth year of king Josiah, when the king sent Shaphan . . . . to Hilkiah the high priest, to count the money that was brought into the house of God, and give it to the masters and builders who repaired the temple, . . . that Hilkiah the high priest said unto Shaphan the scribe," etc.[1] The remaining events indeed follow one another in the narrative, so that they all appear to have happened in succession. But that the arrangement within this section is not chronological but natural, appears clearly from this, that the repairing of the temple must have commenced before the eighteenth year of Josiah, under which it is recapitulated, since in the very beginning of this year, in which at all events the transaction recorded in xxii. 3—7 falls, not only the builders were engaged in the repairs, but money had been already brought by the whole people to the house of God and collected by the Levites who kept the door. Farther, a restoration of the dilapidated temple

[1] Through this compression of the account of the repairing of the temple into one preliminary sentence not merely is the statement, that the royal scribe executed the commission received, omitted, but even the particulars concerning the occasion of the discovery of the book of the law in the temple. Besides, v. 5 is rendered obscure and ambiguous by the omission of a determination essential to perspicuity, and v. 7 wants the suitable connection with that which precedes. In the parallel passage, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—15, indeed, the narrative of the commission which the king gave to Shaphan, and of its execution also, serves only to bring out the discovery of the book of the law, but the whole progress of the affair is there much clearer, and is related more accurately and completely by the addition of several accompanying circumstances, from which at the same time it appears that the high priest found the book of the law, when he with the king's officers was bringing the money out of the temple. This relation of the two narratives presenting itself at once to the eyes of the unprejudiced reader, has, however, been so perverted by de Wette (Beitr. i. p. 67 ff.), that he charges Chronicles with "distortion of the sense, confusion and obscurity," applauds, on the contrary, the harmony and intelligibility of our narrative, and finds all clear and perspicuous. Compare, on the contrary, my apol. Vers. p. 279.

cannot in the nature of things be thought of, without the removal of the superstitious abominations that were found even in the temple. Equally inconceivable is the supposition, that all the people entered into covenant with the Lord (xxiii. 3), before a beginning was made in removing the prevailing superstition, or that the pious king himself should have read the book of the law in the temple and made a covenant before the Lord, while the Asherah was still standing in the temple, and the idolatrous altars erected by Manasseh, with the horses and chariots dedicated to the sun, were still in its courts. If the making or renewing of the covenant in consequence of the law having been publicly read was to be an act correspondent to the law, it could not have been completed without sacrifice. But would the king, who was so deeply alarmed by the curse of the law, have undertaken so solemn a transaction in the presence of the idolatrous altars and other apparatus of superstition in the house of Jehovah, would he not much rather have shrunk from such an undertaking as the most reckless impiety? Lastly, if the narrative were strictly chronological, it must be assumed that after the king had before the passover not only destroyed the idols and idolatrous altars in Jerusalem, but gone round to the whole land of Judah and to Samaria to destroy the altars of the high places and burn the idolatrous priests upon the altars (xxiii. 4—20); again after this passover the necromancers and cunning men, the teraphim and the idols and all the abominations in the land of Judah were spied out and now for the first time destroyed (v. 24). But these considerations sufficiently prove, that the several events of this section are arranged according to their natural connection, not in chronological sequence, and at the same time show that Josiah had begun his reform before the eighteenth year of his reign, and prosecuted it afterwards with still greater zeal. How much of it was effected before, and how much after the passover, cannot be determined from our narrative alone.[1]

[1] The result of the more particular consideration of our narrative tends to confirm the parallel account of Josiah's religious reform in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—33. According to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3, Josiah began in the eighth year of his reign, when a youth of sixteen years, to seek the God of his father David, and in the twelfth year of his reign to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, Asherim and the carved and molten images. But in his eighteenth year he sent also, according

Vv. 3—10. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—18. On the construction of these verses all that is necessary has been already remarked.

to this narrative, his scribe Shaphan to the high priest to take account with him of the money collected for the repair of the temple, and to deliver it to the builders. On this occasion the book of the law was found by Hilkiah, and through Shaphan delivered to the king, the prophetess Huldah consulted thereupon, the book of the law read in the temple in a solemn assembly of the people, and the covenant with the Lord renewed. This narrative closes with the words: "And Josiah took away all the abominations out of all the countries that pertained to the children of Israel, and made all that were present in Israel to serve Jehovah their God; so long as he lived they departed not from Jehovah the God of their fathers" (v. 33.) From these words we may indeed infer that even after the making of the covenant consequent upon the reading of the newly discovered book of the law, the extermination of idolatry was still continued; but not with certainty, inasmuch as they too clearly evince themselves to be a closing formula terminating the section concerning the abolition of idolatry. The passover festival is mentioned in Chronicles (2, xxxv. 1 ff.), only after this concluding formula. Now, if it appeared to us above from the narrative in the Book of Kings, that Josiah prosecuted his reform even after the passover, the narrative of Chronicles may harmonize also with this. For even if Josiah laboured zealously from the twelfth to the eighteenth year of his reign for the removal of superstition, it may be easily conceived that the many monuments of an idolatry pursued for more than half a century, which were spread over the whole land, could not have been all at once eradicated. We must therefore perceive it to be antecedently probable, that after the king and people had, in consequence of the discovery and reading of the book of the law, renewed the covenant with the Lord, many a remnant of superstition will have been found, which was then first destroyed. Thus much, however, appears from the more chronologically exact narrative of Chronicles, that the principal steps for its removal took place before the eighteenth year of Josiah and before the finding of the law. For though it is natural to assume, that the efforts of Josiah for this purpose might have been summarily stated in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—7, and that the king should have in the first place only destroyed the superstitious abominations in Jerusalem and its immediate neighbourhood, and only when encouraged in his zeal by the discovery of the law have carried out its extermination in the whole land and beyond the boundaries of his own kingdom into the cities of Samaria, yet the express statement that money was collected for the repair of the temple not only from Judah and Benjamin, but also from Manasseh, Ephraim, and the whole remnant of Israel (2 Chr. xxxiv. 9), presupposes the contrary, and compels us to assume, that even before the eighteenth year of the king at least an important beginning had been made in the removal of idolatry as well in the whole land of Judah as in all the cities of Samaria. Without such a beginning the people of Judah and Israel would have taken little con-

V. 3. Besides Shaphan, the king sent also, according to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8, Maaseiah, the governor of the city, and Joah the chancellor, because the repair of the temple was no mere private concern of the king and the priests, but an affair of the whole kingdom, and especially of the capital. V. 4. וְיַתֵּם (from תָּמַם *perfecit, absolvit)*, "that he deliver, pay over the money." In what manner the Levites who kept the doors collected the money from the people is not mentioned. According to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 9, they appear to have collected it from the people round the country, and not merely at the gates from the visitors of the temple. The arrangement once made by Joash for this object with chests (comp. xii. 10) is not mentioned here.—V. 5. The *Keri* וְיִתְּנֻהוּ is a bad alteration of the *Kethibh* וְיִתְּנָה or וְיִתְּנֹה = וְיִתְּנוּ, "that he (one) should hand it over." The expression עֹשֵׂי הַמְּלָאכָה is used in a twofold sense; in the first place it signifies the masters of the work, as appears from the addition, "who had the oversight of the house of the Lord;" in the second place the builders, אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית יְהוָֹה, "who were (employed) in the house of the Lord;" for which it is more explicitly said in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 10, אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים בְּב׳ י׳. The construction מֻפְקָדִים בְּבֵית י׳ does not need the alteration of the *keri*, as the *hiph.* הִפְקִיד is also construed

cern in the repair of the temple of Jehovah, and would scarcely have appeared at the passover (2 Chr. xxxiv. 9 and xxxv. 18). In the interval between the finding of the book of the law and the passover the work begun might certainly have been continued, but the matter could not have been taken up from the first, because the passover fell on the fourteenth day of the first month. Upon the whole I cannot admit the correctness of the result obtained by Delitzsch (der Proph. Hab. p. xx.) from the comparison of the two accounts, that "the purification of the temple from idolatrous furniture is to be placed in the eighteenth year of Josiah." But there is absolutely no ground for the violent expedient of Movers (Krit. Unters. p. 334 ff.), that the narrative of Josiah's earlier reformation is introduced in our text in the wrong place, inasmuch as it belongs to the time before the finding of the book of the law; but its insertion in the wrong place is only due to an interpolation, which was affected in the source used by our author. The two learned men proceed on the unfounded assumption, that the author of our books intended to relate the several facts of the religious reformation effected by Josiah in exact chronological order.

*cum acc. pers. et* בְּ *rei*, comp. Jer. xl. 5. But the construction of מִפְקָדִים *cum accus. rei* in v. 9 is unique. וַיִּתְּנוּ אֹתוֹ is no resumption of וַיִּתְּנָה, but connected with the subject עֹשֵׂי הַמְּל׳ "the masters of the work."—Vv. 6 and 7. Comp. on xii. 12, 13, 16. In 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12 the names of the inspectors of the works are also given. V. 8. סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה the book of the law (not, a book of the law, or a roll of the book of the law) can literally and historically mean nothing else than the book of the law of Moses or the Pentateuch. The finding of the book of the law in the temple presupposes that it was long lost. Although it by no means follows from this, that before its discovery there was no other copy of it in the hands of the priests or the people. For the book of the law found is no other than the temple copy,[1] which was deposited beside the ark in the holy of holies, and during the ungodly reigns of Manasseh and Amon, perhaps under Ahaz, when the temple itself had been profaned by idols, and as we may infer from the notification, 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, the ark also removed from its place in the holy of holies, was somehow lost, and was now found again during the repair of the temple. In what place of the temple it had hitherto lain, cannot be ascertained either from our text or from the words, "when they brought out the money that was brought into the house of the Lord, Hilkiah found the book of the law by

[1] Whether the exemplar written by Moses' own hand, as Grotius infers from the בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 14, or a later copy of it, is quite a frivolous question. For, as Hävern. Einl. i. 2 p. 603 very justly remarks, "even in the latter case it was to be considered as good as the autograph, with the same right with which the temple repaired by Josiah still remained the temple of Solomon." The assertions frequently made in the present day in connection with the attacks on the genuineness of the Pentateuch, that the book of the law found was not the whole Pentateuch, but only a part of it, Exodus or Deuteronomy, or a short abstract of the law, or a collection of passages from the last four books of it, or the substance of the older legislation, in reply to which Hävern. Einl. i. 2, p. 601 f. is to be compared, may now be regarded as set aside, since de Wette, the champion against the genuineness of the Pentateuch, in his Einl. p. 212, has acknowledged that our narrative contains "the first certain trace of the existence of our present Pentateuch." The assertion also of the rationalistic critic, that Hilkiah forged the law-book found by him under the name of Moses, has been already so ably refuted by Hävern. p. 597, that we need not farther dwell on it.

Moses," (2 Chr. xxxiv. 14), and is of little importance for the main object of narrative. The different conjectures on the point see in Seb. Schm. *ad h. l.* and *Buddei hist. eccl.* ii. p. 447 f. From וַיִּקְרָאֵהוּ it does not follow, that Shaphan read through the whole book at once. Neither is it implied in the words, "Shaphan read it before the king" (v. 10), that he read to him the whole book from beginning to end, for in the reading of the whole law in the temple (xxiii. 2) אֶת־כָּל־דִּבְרֵי סֵפֶר הב׳ is the form of expression. But what passages or sections Shaphan himself perused and what he read to the king cannot be determined with certainty; but it is probable that among others he read especially the threatenings and curses of the law against its transgressors (Deut. xxviii. and perhaps Lev. xxvi.), because the reading made so terrifying an impression on him, that he rent his clothes from distress of mind.[1] Moreover whether the king was hitherto entirely unacquainted with the book of the law, or was instructed in the law only in a traditional way, or whether he had a copy of the law and had not yet read it through, or had not read it with due attention, so that the passages now read to him made so deep an impression, it is impossible to decide with certainty. Either case is conceivable, as it is known by experience, that books already read, by being read again under peculiar circumstances, make an impression upon us not before received. It is more probable, however, that no copy of the law had been hitherto seen by him, without however inferring from this, that there were no copies among the people except the long lost and now recovered temple copy. The deep and fundamental knowledge of the law, which all the prophets display, necessarily presupposes the dissemination of copies of the Pentateuch among them.

Vv. 11—14. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 19—22. In order to obtain advice in the distress of his heart concerning the punishments denounced against transgressors in the law, the king sent a deputation consisting of the high priest Hilkiah, his secretary

[1] J. D. Michaelis in his remarks on our verse wishes to explain this deep impression partly by the state of the times, the incursion of the Scythians into Asia, and the victories of the Nabopolassar. An explanation as unnecessary as far-fetched and improbable.

Shaphan, and other distinguished persons of his court (אֲשֶׁר לַמֶּלֶךְ 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22), to the prophetess Huldah to enquire through her the will of the Lord. Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, a different person from the king's scribe, appears afterwards as a friend and patron of the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. xxvi. 24); he was the father of Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadnezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem appointed deputy governor over the people who remained in the land (xxv. 22 ff.; Jer. xxxix. 14, xl. 5 f., xlv. 1, xliii. 6.)—Of Achbor (עַכְבּוֹר) nothing farther is known than that his son Elnathan belonged to the courtiers of Zedekiah (Jer. xxvi. 22, xxxvi. 12.) In 2 Chr. xxxiv. 20 stands instead of him עַבְדּוֹן, an obvious mistake of the pen. Asaiah (עֲשָׂיָה) is mentioned nowhere else. Other men of this name occur, 1 Chr. iv. 36, vi. 15, xv. 6, 11, ix. 5.—V. 13. שָׁמַע construed with עַל means here, "to hearken to anything, to obey," for which אֶל is elsewhere used, as xix. 9 שָׁמַע אֶל stands for שָׁמַע עַל "to hear of some one." The explanation given by Hertz i. p. q. p. 160 f., "our fathers have not heard of the words of this book to do according to all that is prescribed to us," gives no appropriate sense.—V. 14. Of the prophetess Huldah we know nothing more than is here stated.[1] Her husband was keeper of the robes, that is, overseer, perhaps not of the priests' garments kept in the temple, as after the Rabbins Witsius (*de prophetissis* in his *Miscellan. ss.* i. p. 366, ed. 3, 1712) thinks, but over the royal wardrobe, and dwelt in Jerusalem בַּמִּשְׁנֶה "in the other part," that is, of the city, probably the lower city, which Joseph. (Antiq. xv. 11, 5) calls ἄλλη πόλις, on the hill Ἄκρα (comp. Rob. Pal. ii. p. 50), as appears evident from Zephaniah i. 10 and Neh. xi. 9, where עִיר מִשְׁנֶה stands. Several Rabb. with the Chald. arbitrarily make מִשְׁנֶה a school-house, בֵּית אוּלְפָנָא in the neighbourhood of the temple; and as arbitrarily the author of the *quaestiones in Paralip.* xxxiv. 22 ascribed to Hieronymus understands thereby *locum extra murum civitatis et antemurale*, and Hitzig on Zeph. i. 10, a new part of

[1] The conjectures of the Rabbins concerning this prophetess, see in Jarchi *ad h. l. et* 2 Chr. xxxiv. 22 and in Meyer's *Annotat. ad Seder Ol.* p. 117 f.

the city on the west within the external wall built by Manasseh; comp. on the contrary Maur. and Strauss on Zeph. i. 10.—For the names תִּקְוָה and חַרְחַס stand in 2 Chr. xxxv. 24 the forms תּוֹקְהַת and חַסְרָה. The expositors here raise also the question, why the king applied to Huldah and not to the prophet Jeremiah, who had then made his appearance. Kimchi has given the most probable answer to this, that Jeremiah was at the time in Anathoth, his native town.

Vv. 15—20. The prophetess Huldah confirms the apprehension expressed by the king, that the anger of the Lord was kindled against the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah on account of their opposition to his word, and announces that the Lord will bring all the words of the book read by the king, that is, all the punishments denounced in the law of Moses against backsliders and idolaters, upon Jerusalem and its inhabitants, but adds for the pious king the consolatory promise, that, on account of his sincere penitence and humiliation before the Lord, he shall not live to see the evil or the punishment threatened, but be gathered to his fathers in peace. In this answer of Huldah are distinguished, "the man that sent to her" (v. 15), and "the king of Judah who sent to enquire of the Lord" (v. 18.) J. D. Mich. understands by "the man" the individual person of Josiah, and by the king, the Jewish king *in abstracto*, and thinks, therefore, that the words "man" and "king" are misplaced by the fault of the transcriber. But the distinction is false, and the position of the words is quite correct. The man who sent to the prophetess is certainly in fact the king Josiah; but the general designation of him as "the man who sent to me," proves that by this is not to be understood the individual person of Josiah, but every man who wished to enquire of the prophetess the will of the Lord concerning the book of the law. To this man should the truth and certain fulfilment of the word of God be simply announced. But by the king of Judah is not to be understood the king in abstract generality, but the concrete person of the penitent and God-fearing king Josiah, to whom it was to be announced, that he should not live to see in his own person the threatened misfortune.—To the words הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתָּ (v. 18) we are not to supply a preposition, as עַל or

לְ (Cler.), nor the thought *eventura quidem erunt* (Vatabl.); but they stand absolutely, forming a protasis, the apodosis to which follows at the end of v. 19, but so that by an anacoluthon the apodosis attaches itself in form to the intervening sentence in v. 19, "As regards the words which thou hast heard, because thine heart was tender . . . and thou didst weep before me, I will also hear thee, saith the Lord." . . . Comp. *L. de Dieu* and *Starkii not. sell. ad h. l.*—V. 19. יַעַן רַךְ־לְבָבְךָ "because thine heart was tender," that is, was faint because of the punishment threatened to sinners, comp. Deut. xx. 3; Is. vii. 4; Jer. li. 46.—לִהְיוֹת לְשַׁמָּה וגו׳ "that they should become a desolation and a curse." These words often employed by the prophets, but occurring thus connected only in Jer. xliv. 22, rest on Lev. xxvi., and Deut. xxviii., where the transgressors of the commandments of the Lord are threatened with desolation of the land and every kind of curse. V. 20. "Behold, therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace." The phrase, to gather to his fathers, means merely, to cause to die, and is commonly indeed used of a gentle peaceful death, though sometimes also, as the cognate expression, to lie with his fathers, of a violent termination of life by murder, comp. xiv. 19, 22; 1 Ki. xxii. 34—40, so that this consolatory promise may be very well reconciled with Josiah's being slain in battle (xxiii. 29.) בְּשָׁלוֹם, which is in the most natural manner related to both sentences, denotes not so much a peaceful end by death on a sick bed, but is much rather determined by the following sentence to this, that he is to die, and be laid in his grave in peace, before the threatened judgment will have broken upon the city and land.

Chap. xxiii. vv. 1—3. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 29—32. Instead of resting satisfied with this, that freedom from this judgment was promised to him, Josiah much more did all that was in his power to bring his people to true conversion to the Lord, thereby to avert as much as possible the threatened curse, as the Lord had promised in his word forgiveness and grace to the penitent. He therefore assembled the elders of the people, then proceeded with them, the priests and the whole congregated people, to the

temple, there caused the book of the law to be read to the congregation, and made a covenant with the Lord, to which the people assented, binding themselves to walk uprightly in the commandments of the Lord. V. 2. Instead of הַנְּבִיאִים in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 30 we have הַלְוִיִּם. The older interpreters reconcile the two statements by the assumption, that these prophets were of the priests and Levites, as Jeremiah, who was of the priestly city Anathoth, and Urijah, who came from the Levitical city, Kirjath-jearim (Jer. xxvi. 20.) But this method is unnatural. The difference consisting of one word only, while all else agrees, can only be explained by an error of the pen, and this error falls to the charge, not of the author of Chronicles, but of that of Kings, or a transcriber of the latter book. For as there were at that time not more than two or three prophets (Zephaniah, Urijah, and perhaps Jeremiah) in Jerusalem, we should not expect special mention of them, though we might of the Levites along with the priests. וַיִּקְרָא he read, that is, caused to be read; for the king, who had the book already read to him, was certainly not himself the reader in the temple before the assembled people, as Abarb. and others thought.—V. 3. On וַיַּעֲמֹד וגו׳ comp. xi. 14; on וַיִּכְרֹת וגו׳ xi. 17; and on וְלִשְׁמֹר וגו׳ see above p. 20.—לְהָקִים וגו׳ "to establish the words of this covenant," that is, to realize them by deed, by fulfilling the commandments in the life, comp. Deut. xxvii. 26.—וַיַּעֲמֹד - - בַּבְּרִית "and all the people stood to the covenant" (Luth., D. W., and others), that is, accepted it, bound themselves to its observance. On the contrary Maur. and Ges. (*thes.* ii. 1039) explain, *et perstitit, perseveravit in fœdere.* The first view has the connexion, the second the grammar in its favour. We must therefore reconcile the two by assuming the construction to be pregnant: "they assented and adhered to the covenant."

Vv. 4—20. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxiv. 3—7, 33. Farther, Josiah caused all the monuments and remnants of idolatry existing in his whole kingdom to be exterminated, and even in Bethel and the other cities of Samaria the altars and houses of the high places to be destroyed, and the high priests to be slain. That the extirpation of idolatry effected by Josiah, which is here described, belongs not entirely but only in its close to the time

after the finding of the book of the law and the renewal of the covenant, has been already shown on ch. xxii. 3 ff.

Vv. 4—14. Extirpation of idolatry in Jerusalem and Judah. V. 4. כֹּהֲנֵי הַמִּשְׁנֶה *sacerdotes secundi ordinis* (Vulg., Luth., and others), the ordinary priests. The Rabb. falsely explain it of the *vicariis summi sacerdotis*. כָּל־הַכֵּלִים "every vessel" (Luth.), that is, the whole apparatus that was used in the worship of the gods, to which belonged the altars, idols, and other materials of worship. All these objects Josiah caused to be burned, as the law required (Deut. vii. 25), and indeed as unclean things without the city Jerusalem at the fields of Kidron. The שַׁדְמוֹת קִדְרוֹן are probably to be sought north-east of the city, where the valley of Kidron is broader than between the city and the Mount of Olives, and expands itself especially in a basin of some extent, which is at present cultivated, and contains plantations of olives and other fruit trees (Rob. Pal. ii. p. 33.) The brook Kidron in the east of the city (comp. 1 Ki. ii. 37) "is now nothing more than the deep bed of a winter torrent, that bears evident traces of being sometimes overflowed with a great body of water." Only during the heavy rains of winter does a stream flow in it, and even then not constantly, and the valley appears to have had no more water in former times than now (Rob. p. 38.)—"And carried their dust to Bethel," that is, the ashes of the wooden things burned, and the dust of the stone and metal articles of worship that were broken down, he caused to be carried to Bethel, in order to defile with these the idolatrous places of worship there.—V. 5. "And he removed the priests of the high places." כְּמָרִים occurring besides here only in Hos. x. 5, and Zeph. i. 4, denotes not priests of idols or even prophets of Baal (Hitzig on Zeph.), but, according to the express statement of our author, those priests whom the kings of Judah had appointed to offer incense on the altars of the high places, from whom the priests of the idols and those who offered incense to Baal, the sun, etc., were distinct. In Hos. x. 5 the priests appointed for the golden calves at Bethel are called כמרים. In Zeph. i. 4 also, כמרים are not exclusively priests of idols, but illegitimate priests in general, as well those who served Jehovah degraded into Baal as those who worshipped pro-

per idols. As, moreover, in v. 8, there are כֹּהֲנִים mentioned, who burned incense on the high places, we must understand by the כמרים non-levitical priests of the high places, and by כהנים (v. 8) levitical priests consecrated to the worship on high places. The proper meaning of כמרים is contested, comp. the different explanations in Pfeiffer, *dub. vex.* p. 455, and Iken, *dissert. philol. theol. num.* 12. The derivation, proposed after some Rabbins by most expositors, even by Ges. (*thes.* ii. 693), from כמר *nigredo*, according to which they must have received their name from their black dress, is decidedly opposed by the fact that neither the priests of the idols nor of the high places were ascetics or monks, and in ancient times the priests from India to Gaul wore robes of a white, and if possible of a brilliant white colour, comp. Bähr's Symbol. ii. p. 87 f. and the works there quoted.[1] It comes much rather either from כָּמַר in the Talmudical signification *abscondere* (comp. Buxt. *lex. rabb.* p. 1051) and denotes *eos qui latebras et secessus quaerebant, quo tutius imponerent vulgo* (Pfeiffer *l. c.*), or more probably *a voce* כָּמַר (לאט, קמר, כמן) *vi occulendi magicasque h. e. arcanas et reconditas artes exercendi dicti esse videntur* (Fürst, *Concord.* p. 559.) וַיְקַטֵּר and burned incense, namely, each of them, that is, that they might burn incense. מַזָּלוֹת are the signs of the zodiac, comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 869. Concerning this worship see on xxi. 3. —V. 6. הָאֲשֵׁרָה is here = פֶּסֶל הָאֲשֵׁרָה comp. xxi. 3 and 7. This figure of Asherah Manasseh had made and placed in the temple, and after his return from Babylon no doubt removed (2 Chr. xxxiii. 15), but Amon had again replaced. Josiah destroyed it, burned the wood to ashes, and ground the metallic plating to powder. In the valley of Kidron, Asa had once burned an image (1 Ki. xv. 13), and Hezekiah had deposited (2 Chr. xxix. 16) the impurities (of idolatry) removed from the city. This valley was thus already defiled, even if it had not been regarded as unclean, because, according to our author, the

[1] Priests only sometimes wore black robes, when they sacrificed to subterranean gods, comp. Braun, *de vestitu sacerd.* i. p. 181 f., and the priests of Isis, when they awaited the return of the moonlight, τοῖς δὲ μελανοστόλοις ἐμφαίνουσι τὰς κρύψεις καὶ τοὺς περισκιασμοὺς, ἐν οἷς διώκει ποθοῦσα τὸν Ἥλιον. Plutarch *de Iside* in Calmet *ad h. l.*

burial ground of the common people was there. "The powder of the Asherah he cast upon the graves of the children of the people." בְּנֵי הָעָם denotes the people, the eminent and the humble, who had polluted themselves by idolatry, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 4—, in order to profane the graves of these idolaters (*in contemtum, si non etiam maledictionem mortuorum et in terrorem viventium.* Seb. Schm.)—V. 7. בָּתֵּי הַקְּדֵשִׁים the houses of the paramours (see above p. 227 f.) are perhaps only tents, that were erected in the court of the temple for the residence of these paramours, in which at the same time women lived, who worked shrines for Asherah, comp. on xvii. 30. On this worship, among others, Movers (d. Rel. d. Phön. i. p. 686) remarks: the castrated *gallus* (קָדֵשׁ) imagines himself to be a woman: *negant se viros esse . . . . mulieres se volunt credi. Firmic.* He lives in the society of the women, and these again are singularly attached to the *gallus;* and offers at the same time the conjecture, that the women of Jerusalem prostituted themselves in honour of the goddess in the tents of the *galli* pitched in the court of the temple, for which the מחיר כלב came into the treasury of the temple.—Verses 8 and 9 can only have the sense, that Josiah brought the Levitical priests who had offered incense on the high places in the cities of Judah to Jerusalem, and forbade them for the future to make offerings on the altar of Jehovah, and thus excluded them from all priestly functions, but allowed them, as those priests who were excluded from the service of the altar on account of a corporeal defect, to draw their support from the revenues of the sanctuary according to the law Lev. xxi. 17—23. The high places throughout the whole land he defiled probably by scattering upon them the dust of men's bones (v. 14), and broke down the altars of high places erected at the gate of Jerusalem. כהנים are not *sacerdotes falsorum deorum* (Cler.), but priests of the tribe of Levi, who had addicted themselves to the worship of the high places (S. Schm. and others), on which account they are called (v. 9) כֹּהֲנֵי הַבָּמוֹת.—"From Geba to Beersheba" denotes the kingdom of Judah in its whole extent from north to south. Geba (גֶּבַע) assigned to the tribe of Benjamin, but transferred from this to the priests (Jos. xviii. 24, xxi. 17; 1 Chr. vi. 45), formed, according to our author and Zech.

xiv. 10, the northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah, and lay, according to Euseb. and Hieron., five Roman miles from Gophna, towards Neapolis. This place is, therefore, neither to be identified with Jeba or Gibeah of Saul or Benjamin, between es Suweinit and Wady Farah, or between Mukhmas and er Ram, nor to be sought in its neighbourhood, but is preserved in the Moslemite village Jibia (جيبيا) in the Wady el Jib (Rob. Pal. iii. p. 298), between Sinjil, that is, Bethel (see above p. 326), and Jifna (Gophna).[1]—Concerning Beer-sheba, see vol. i. p. 288.

[1] As much obscurity and contradiction still prevails among expositors and biblical geographers concerning Geba and Gibeah, inasmuch as most of them, down to v. Raumer, (Pal. p. 194), and Rob. (Pal. ii. p. 328), seek Geba in the vicinity of Gibeah and Ramah, and Winer (R.W. i. p. 465), on this presumption, declares the statement of Euseb. and Hieron. concerning the situation of Geba to be manifestly false, whereas Knobel, on Is. x. 29, absolutely denies the existence of a Geba in the tribe of Benjamin distinct from Gibeah, a revision of this question will not be superfluous. It may be regarded as generally admitted, that the Gibeah so often mentioned in the book of Judges, xix. and xx., and in 1 Sam., especially in xiii. and xiv., is one with Gibeah of Benjamin or Gibeah of Saul, east of Ramah (er Ram) and south of Michmash (Mukhmas), which is preserved in the village Jeba, between the Wady es Suweinit and W. Farah, comp. Rob. p. 325 f., and Thenius in Käuffer's Studien ii. p. 149. But this Gibeah is sometimes called Geba also in the Old Testament, as in Judg. xx. 10 and 33; 1 Sam. xiii. 3, xiv. 5, or even Geba of Benjamin, as in 1 Sam. xiii. 16, whereby the assumption of a Geba in the neighbourhood of Gibeah and Ramah has arisen. But that this assumption is quite unfounded, and that Geba in these places is only a variation of Gibeah, every one will be convinced who will carefully peruse these chapters; we may compare only in Judg. xx. v. 9 and 10.—But in 1 Sam. xiii. and xiv., Thenius (Comm. on the passage), has already recognized the identity and explained גֶּבַע as written for גִּבְעָה. But the notion of a Geba in the vicinity of Gibeah, derives its chief support from Is. x. 29, where the names Geba, Ramah and Gibeah of Saul, occur together. But even this passage proves nothing, and may easily with Knobel be so explained, that Geba is one with Gibeah of Saul, only another form of Gibeah. Besides the passages quoted here and above in the text, Geba is also mentioned in 2 Sam. v. 25; 1 Ki. xv. 22; 1 Chr. viii. 6; 2 Chr. xvi. 6, and after the exile, in Ezr. ii. 26; Neh. vii. 30, xi. 31, and xii. 29. In 2 Sam. v. 25, ("David smote the Philistines from Geba unto Gazer), Geba stands for Gibeon, as may be seen from the parallel passage, 1 Chr. xiv. 16, and in 1 Ki. xv. 22; 2 Chr. xvi. 6, probably for Gibeah, as has been already remarked above, p. 235. Lastly, the passage, 1 Chr. viii. 6, affords no decisive ground for

—The following somewhat obscure sentence, וְנָתַץ אֶת הַבָּמוֹת 'תגו is to be apprehended thus: "he broke down the high places at the gates, (especially) those before the gate of Joshua, the governor of the city, which were at the left hand of any one (going in or out) at the gate of the city." At the city gates also altars of high places were erected, that those coming into the city and going out might there worship and offer. Now as besides these בָּמוֹת הַשְּׁעָרִים the בָּמָה before the gate of Joshua is mentioned, this can only thereby be rendered prominent as being particularly celebrated and specially sought after by the idolaters, although this is not indicated in the text by any particle. Hence Cler., Dathe, Maur., and others have supplied *et praesertim* before אֲשֶׁר. The following אֲשֶׁר before עַל־שְׂמֹאול may not be referred with J. H. Mich. to שַׁעַר but only to the high place (במה) before the gate of Joshua, and עַל־שְׂמֹאול אִישׁ can only mean to the left of any one, namely, who goes in or out (Cler., Schulz, Dathe, and others). At which of the gates of Jerusalem the governor of the city dwelt, so that it was named after him, is totally unknown.—V. 9. אָכַל מַצּוֹת to eat unleavened bread, means to derive his sustenance from the offerings brought to the altar, not, however, burned on it but designed to be eaten by the priests, comp. Lev. vi. 9, and xxii. 11—13, with xxi. 21 f.—V. 10. תֹּפֶת from תּוּף to spit out, is an object of abhorrence, an abomination, Job xvii. 16, an abominable place. Hence the place in the valley of Benhinnom was κατ'

the determination of the place. Knobel on Is. x. 29, however, goes too far when he rejects the existence of a Geba in the tribe of Benjamin distinct from Gibeah. For, not to speak of 2 Ki. xxiii. 8, and Zech. xiv. 10, where Geba is named as the northern boundary of the kingdom of Judah, which the Gibeah lying south of Mukhmas could not be, and to omit the testimony of Euseb. and Hieron. concerning the situation of Geba on the northern border of Benjamin, this assertion is contradicted by the list of the Benjamite cities in Jos. xviii., where, besides Geba (v. 24), a גִּבְעַת in the south, not far from Jerusalem, is mentioned (v. 28), and still more by the fact that both places are still preserved to this day with their old names. On the contrary the circumstance that after the exile, Geba only, and not Gibeah, is mentioned, can prove nothing, as the passages Ezr. ii. 22—28; Neh. vii. 27—33, and xi. 31—35, contain no complete lists of the Benjamite towns.

ἐξοχήν called הַתֹּפֶת, the abominable place, which served for a slaughtering place to the city, inasmuch as here on the funeral piles the carcases of the dead animals were burnt, comp. Is. xxx. 33, and Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 598. In this valley, when Ahaz introduced the worship of Molech into Judah (xvi. 3), the statue of Molech was erected, and Tophet chosen for the burning of children in the fire to Molech. The valley בְּנֵי הִנֹּם or בֶן־הִנֹּם (Jos. xv. 8, and elsewhere), lies on the south side of Mount Zion, see the description of it in Rob. Pal. ii. p. 38 ff.—V. 11. Josiah also removed the horses consecrated to the sun, and burned the chariots of the sun. Although horses were sacred to the sun and were offered to him among many nations, Armenians, Persians, Massagetans, Ethiopians, and Greeks, (see the testimonies in Bochart's *Hieroz.* i. *lib.* 2, *c.* 10), yet the Israelites certainly received this religious practice first with the proper sun-worship, from upper Asia through the Assyrian, so that by the מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה can only be understood Ahaz, Manasseh, and Amon. The horses consecrated to the sun were not merely *picti aut sculpti* or *equorum quadrigarumque fusae imagines* (Selden *de diis Syr.* ii. 8), but real horses, as Corn. a Lap., Boch., and others have rightly concluded from the circumstance, that they were not burned or broken together with the chariots, but merely removed, (וַיַּשְׁבֵּת). But whether, according to the uniform statement of the Rabbins (Jarchi, Kimchi, Levi Gers.), they were only dedicated to the sun, and were kept to meet the rising sun, or, as Boch. and many expositors conjecture, were also slain, as offerings to the sun, cannot be certainly determined. Probably the former only was the case.—The words מִבֹּא בֵית יְהוָה וגו' are variously conceived. De Wette renders: "that they came no more into the house of the Lord into the chamber of Nathan-melech the eunuch, who dwelt in the suburbs." Decidedly wrong; for וַיַּשְׁבֵּת needs no stricter determination, as appears from v. 5 and from the thing itself. If the horses consecrated to the sun were removed it is manifest of itself they could no longer come into the temple. Others render: "from the entrance into the house of the Lord to the chamber of Nathan-melech," wherein it is pre-supposed either that the horses were kept loose within

this space, or that their stables were there. The words are connected not with וַיַּשְׁבֵּת but with נָתְנוּ, and are to be rendered: *ab introitu domus Jovae in cellulam etc.*, that is, from the temple-entrance, or on the side of the temple entrance, into the chamber . . . . The horses were quartered in the chamber of Nathan-melech. The chamber which obtained its name from Nathan-melech, a courtier not otherwise known, perhaps its builder, was בַּפַּרְוָרִים, that is, not in the suburbs, but in the outer court of the temple. Ges. (*thes.* ii. 1123) rightly identifies פרורים with פַּרְבָּר, 1 Chr. xxvi. 18, and understands it *de parte quadam atriorum templi Salomonei*, or of open halls, *porticus apertae, quae templi atria cingebant, ex quibus introitus erat in cellulas.* But the etymology and primary meaning are still doubtful. Böttcher (Proben p. 347) understands פרורים, פרבר of a "suburb-like separate building;" Ges. *l. c.* explains it from the Persian.—V. 12. The altars erected on the roof of the *alijah* of Ahaz, which were consecrated to the Lord of heaven (Zeph. i. 5; Jer. xix. 13, xxxii. 29), can only have been built by Ahaz, and, as Hezekiah in his religious reform would scarcely allow them to remain, must have been restored by Manasseh and Amon. מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה is to be understood as in v. 11. Concerning the altars built by Manasseh in the two courts of the temple see on xxi. 5. וַיָּרָץ מִשָּׁם "he broke them off, destroyed them from thence;" יָרָץ from רָצַץ, not from רוּץ "he ran from thence" (S. Schm., de Wette, and others.)—On the high places mentioned v. 13 comp. on 1 Ki. xi. 5—8. It is to be observed that here not destruction but only defilement (טִמֵּא) of the במות is mentioned, from which it is plain that the altars erected by Solomon to the gods of his wives were no longer extant in the time of Josiah, but only the high places (במות), earth or stone heaps, on which, perhaps, the superstitious people still occasionally burned incense and made offerings to the gods. הַר הַמַּשְׁחִית denotes at all events the mount of Olives on the east side of Jerusalem, even if משחית be variously explained, inasmuch as some connect it with מָשַׁח to anoint, *mons olivarum est mons* הַמִּשְׁחָה *i.e. unctionis* (Jarchi, Cler., and others), others more correctly derive it from שָׁחַת to corrupt.

But מַשְׁחִית is here not *partic. hiph.*, as for example Ex. xii. 13, 23, ὁ ὀλοθρεύων, but a noun-form with מ = מַשְׁחֵת *corruptio;* comp. Hävern. Comm. on Dan. p. 427. The mount of Olives is called the mount of corruption on account of the idol altars built on it. The Vulg. renders *mons offensionis;* accordingly in ecclesiastical tradition the southern part of the mount of Olives still bears the name of the mount of offence.—V. 14 does not treat of the objects of Solomon's idolatry, but the still remaining idols removed by Josiah are here mentioned in order to close the description of that which this pious king did for the extirpation of all monuments of idolatry within the bounds of his kingdom. On מַצֵּבוֹת and אֲשֵׁרִים comp. vol. i. p. 240.

Vv. 15--20. Not content with having eradicated every remnant of idolatry from his own kingdom, Josiah proceeded to the territory of the former kingdom of the ten tribes, and in Bethel and the other cities of Samaria destroyed the altars and temples of the high places, burned the Asherim that were in them, and profaned these places of worship for ever by taking the bones of the priests of the high places from their graves, and burning them upon the destroyed במות,[1] as the man of God from Judah had

[1] Here the question may arise, by what right Josiah could eradicate idolatry in the cities of Samaria, as neither Bethel nor the remaining cities of the former kingdom of Israel were under his dominion. Many learned men, as Prideaux (Connexion i. p. 48) and Hess (Gesch. d. Kg. ii. p. 223 f.), think, that Josiah as vassal of the king of Assyria had a certain, not indeed unlimited dominion over this region, and might regard it in some measure as his territory, and this was the more readily conceded to him on the part of the Assyrians, as they were secure of his fidelity in regard to Egypt. But that Josiah was a vassal of the Assyrians can neither be inferred from the release of Manasseh from his imprisonment in Babylon, nor proved from any other historical testimony. There is more probability in the remark of Jahn (bibl. Archaeol. ii. 1, p. 195), that the remaining Israelites could not resist the designs of Josiah, because their masters, the kings of Assyria, were involved in dangerous wars, partly with the invading Scythians, partly with Nabopolassar, who had shortly before ascended the throne of Babylon. Meanwhile the circumstance, that before the eighteenth year of Josiah the Levites had collected contributions from the remaining Israelites for the repair of the temple, rather presupposes a friendly relation of the Israelites to the kingdom of Judah, so that Josiah might extend his reform over the former Israelitish territory, not against their will by force, but with the consent if not of all, yet of

predicted to Jeroboam, 1 Ki. xiii.—V. 16. אֲשֶׁר שָׁם בָּהָר "that were there in the mount," that is, the mount at Bethel, on which now lies the village Singil, see p. 325 f.—V. 17. צִיּוּן a monument, here a tomb stone, comp. Ges. *thes.* iii. 1156.—The words אֲשֶׁר־בָּא מִשֹּׁמְרוֹן (v. 18) are to be explained according to אֲשֶׁר־בָּא מִיהוּדָה (v. 17); they denote merely the coming from the land of Israel (Samaria), from an undefined part of the kingdom of the ten tribes, from which that old prophet came to Bethel, and was buried there. On v. 17, 18, comp. 1 Ki. xiii. 26—32.

Vv. 21—23. On this Josiah ordered a passover festival, in which not merely his own subjects, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Judah, and Benjamin should take part, but the surviving remnant of the tribes of Israel (2 Chr. xxxv. 18) should appear in Jerusalem. This festival is described more fully and circumstantially in 2 Chr. xxxv. 1—19, both in respect to that which the king and his nobles did for the celebration of it, and with regard to the zeal displayed by the priests and Levites in its preparation. This festival was undertaken so solemnly and so exactly according to the precept of the law, that the historian remarks of it: such a passover was not holden from the days of the judges, or during the whole time of the kings. The older interpreters have rightly observed, that earlier passover festivals are not denied in this remark. *Dicendum*—says for example S. Schm.—*quod istorum* (that is, of David and other pious kings) *etiam tempore Pascha non intermissum, non tamen tanta frequentia et ritu publico Hierosolymis et exacte juxta legem factum sit.* Cler. has given prominence to the last point alone, when he says: *crediderim hoc velle scriptorem sacrum, per tempora regum nunquam ab omnibus, secundum omnes leges Mosaicas tam accurate Pascha cele-*

the better disposed majority of the Israelites, the remainder of whom, together with the heathen colonists, must have acquiesced. To assume such a friendly approximation of the Israelites remaining in the country to Judah, involves no improbability, as it is known, that at a subsequent period the Samaritans wished to take part in the building of the temple under Zerubbabel. But their Assyrian sovereigns were unable to oppose either this approximation or the proceedings of Josiah, as the Assyrian empire was at that time approaching its fall, if not already subjugated by the Chaldeans and Medes.

*bratum fuisse. Consuetudinem antea, etiam sub piis regibus, videntur secuti potius quam ipsa verba legis; quod cum fit, multa necessario mutantur ac negliguntur. Sed inventi nuper libri verba attendi diligentissime voluit Josias.* Even the pious Hezekiah in the passover celebrated by him must of necessity have deviated in many points from the law of Moses; comp. my apolog. Vers. p. 399 f.—Instead of, "from the days of the Judges who judged Israel," (v. 22), in 2 Chr. xxxv. 18, it is, "from the days of Samuel the prophet," who it is well known closed the period of the judges.

V. 24. In conclusion it is stated, that Josiah put away from the land the necromancers and teraphim, and all other traces of idolatry in order to raise (הָקִים) the discovered book of the law to full legitimate authority. Concerning אֹבוֹת and יִדְּעֹנִים comp. on xxi. 6. תְּרָפִים are not middle gods, serving for the investigation of the future, which might be set up in connexion with every system of religion (Hengstenb. Christol. ii. p. 177, and iii. p. 129), but family gods, to which were attached notions of a blessing proceeding magically from them to their possessors, Penates, which the ancestors of the Israelites brought with them from Mesopotamia, which were admitted into Hebraism from the time of the judges, and connected with the worship of Jehovah, and first became oracle-speaking gods by being associated (Judg. xvii. 5) with the ephod, the robe of the high priest, "inasmuch as the more general older notion of their magic power passed into the more special one of their soothsaying efficacy;" comp. Hävern. Comm. on Ezekiel, p. 347 ff. In this sense are the תרפים named here and Ezek. xxi. 16; Zech. x. 2. The name is connected with تَرِفَ *bonis commodisque vitae affluxit;* comp. Häv. p. 349.

Vv. 25—27. After our author has described Josiah's zealous labours for the restoration of the true worship of the Lord, he adds a general judgment concerning the real conversion of this king to the Lord, but immediately annexes to it the farther remark, that the Lord did not cease from his great anger kindled against Judah by the sins of Manasseh, but announced the determination to cast out Judah from his sight, as he had cast Israel

and to withdraw his grace from Jerusalem, the chosen city, as well as from the temple, which was designed to be the place of revealing his presence. This introduces not only the end of the reign of Josiah, but at the same time the end of the kingdom of Judah henceforth hastening with rapid steps to its fall.—V. 25. The formula, with which Hezekiah's piety was described (xviii. 3), that his like was not among all kings, is here applied to Josiah's sincere conversion to the Lord according to the law of Moses. The description, "with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might," contains the law of love to the Lord, Deut. vi. 5, comp. Luk. x. 27.—V. 26. עַל כָּל־הַכְּעָסִים "because of all the provocations with which Manasseh had provoked him." Manasseh is named here, in xxiv. 3 and Jer. xv. 4, as the one who, by his idolatry and wickedness, brought the Divine sentence inevitably on Jerusalem and Judah, not as the only godless king of Judah, but as the one who pushed his godlessness to the greatest extreme, so that the genuine repentance of the people was no longer possible. By the zeal of the pious Josiah, indeed, the external worship of idols was abolished, and the people assented to the covenant made with the Lord, but they did not turn to the Lord with all their heart. *Quamvis enim rex religiosissimus esset populusque metu ei pareret, propterea tamen animus populi non erat mutatus, ut satis liquet ex castigationibus Jeremiae, Sophoniae et aliorum prophetarum, qui circa haec tempora et paulo post vaticinati sunt.* Cler. Jeremiah particularly discloses the deep degradation and gross moral corruption of the people during and after Josiah's reformation of religion, in the first ten chapters of his prophecies, which contain a recapitulation of his prophetic activity under Josiah (comp. Häv. Einl. ii. 1, p. 209 ff.) The sentence of Judah's rejection already announced to Manasseh himself (xxi. 16 ff.) could not therefore be averted by Josiah. On v. 27 comp. xvii. 20 and 23.

Vv. 28—30. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxv. 20—27. Towards the end of Josiah's reign the catastrophe began to unfold itself, by which the kingdom of Judah was to be overturned, when the Egyptian king Nechoh entered upon his expedition to the Euphrates. On his march through Palestine Josiah encountered him, but lost his life in the battle of Megiddo, and was carried dead to Jeru-

salem, and there laid in his grave בְּשָׁלוֹם (xxii. 20.) This event, which is very briefly stated in our narrative, is more fully and particularly related in Chronicles i. p. q.; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 481 f.—The Egyptian king Nechoh (נְכֹה or נְכוֹ Jer. xlvi. 2 and 2 Chr. xxxv. 20), called in the LXX., by Josephus (Antiq. x. 5, 1), and Manetho in Jul. Afric. and Euseb., *Νεχαώ*, by Herod. ii. 158 f., iv. 42, and Diodor. Sic. i. 33, *Νεκώς*, was, according to Manetho, the sixth king of the twenty-sixth or second Saitic dynasty, the second Pharaoh of the name, the son of Psammitichus and grandson of Nechoh I., and, according to Herodotus, celebrated for a canal which he caused to be dug in order to connect the Nile with the Red Sea, as well as for the circumnavigation of Africa; comp. Winer R.W. ii. p. 172 f. and Ges. *thes.* ii. 885.—By the "king of Assyria," whom Nechoh calls his hereditary foe (בֵּית מִלְחַמְתִּי 2 Chr. xxxv. 21) can only be understood here Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, who put an end to the Assyrian monarchy by the destruction of Nineveh, and had transferred the sovereignty hitherto exercised by Assyria over upper Asia to the Babylonians or Chaldeans. He is called king of Assyria, because he ruled the Assyrian empire. In the same sense Jeremiah (ii. 8) uses אַשּׁוּר for בָּבֶל.[1]

[1] Wilh. Hupfeld (*exercitt. Herodot.* i. p. 7) has indeed cursorily inferred from our author, that the Assyrian empire was at that time still standing; others, for example Ges. *thes.* ii. 882 and Hitzig in his preliminary remarks on Nahum, have concluded from Herodotus, that Nineveh was conquered and destroyed in the interval between 606—597 B.C., or even later. But our author affords no proof of this, and as to the account of Herod. i. 103 and 106, that Cyaxares in his first attempt upon Nineveh was prevented from conquering it by the invasion of the Scythians, and only after the Scythian dominion over Asia, which lasted twenty-eight years, began anew the siege of the Assyrian capital, conquered Nineveh and put an end to the Assyrian empire, it is at the same time assumed in it, that Cyaxares became king of Medea in the year 633, so that, if we place his first attempt against Nineveh between 633 and 625, the conquest of it occurring twenty-eight years later cannot have been earlier than between 605 and 597. But this opinion concerning the beginning of the reign of Cyaxares rests again on the presumption that Cyrus was twenty-nine years king over the Medes, and therefore ascended the Median throne in 558, whereas Herod. i. 214 merely says: *βασιλεύσας τὰ πάντα ἑνὸς δέοντα τριήκοντα ἔτεα*, which we must necessarily understand of the time when he became king of the Persians, as according to Xenoph., Cyrop., Cyax-

Since Josiah marched against the Egyptian king and encoun-

ares (II.) was king in Media after the conquest of Babylon, and then first gave him his daughter to wife and with her the right of succession in Media (*Cyrop.* viii. 5, 18 f.), but Cyrus, according to Euseb. *Chron. arm.* i. p. 21, ruled over Babylonia only nine years, and according to Xenoph. Cyrop. viii. 7, 1, died in the seventh year of his reign (that is, of his sole sovereignty over the Babylonio-Medo-Persian kingdom after the death of Cyaxares). But even if we overlook the contradiction in which Herodotus is involved with Xenophon and the Bible, which recognizes Cyaxares II., the son of Astyages, under the name of Darius Medus, as sovereign of the Chaldean kingdom (Dan. ix. 1), inasmuch as he makes the sovereignty of the Medes to cease with Astyages, and is totally silent about the son of Astyages, Cyaxares II., yet the twofold siege of Nineveh by Cyaxares (I.), mentioned by Herodotus, together with the intervening twenty-eight years' domination of the Scythians, cannot be placed in the interval between 630 and 600, or even later, because the Lydian war of Cyaxares, which was terminated by the solar eclipse foretold by Thales, and occurring, according to the investigations of Ideler and Waltmann (see Ideler Hdb. d. Chronol. i. p. 209), in 610, falls not before but after the end of the Scythian dominion, and in all probability only after the conquest of Nineveh, as the Scythians, when they gave occasion to this war, appear no longer as masters, but rather as servants and adherents of Cyaxares, and Labynetus (Nabopolassar) of Babylon intervenes as mediator, for which purpose an Assyrian deputy would scarcely have been selected (Herod. i. 73 and 74 comp. with 106.) But had the twenty-eight years' dominion of the Scythians already ceased in 610, Cyaxares, under whom it should have begun, must have come to the sovereignty a considerable time before 633. Accordingly, the accounts of Herodotus concerning Cyaxares prove to be of no avail to determine the year, in which, with the destruction of Nineveh, the Assyrian empire fell; and, as from the biblical statements it only appears with certainty that Nineveh was destroyed before the year 606, comp. Delitzch on Habak. p. xix., we are left merely to the scanty notices of Alex. Polyhistor and Abydenus compared with the canon of Ptolemy. According to Abydenus, in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 25, the last Assyrian king Saracus, on the intelligence that hostile troops were advancing to his kingdom from the sea, sent his general Busalosor to Babylon; but the latter here formed the determination to rebel against him, betrothed Amuhia, the daughter of the Median prince Asdahages, to his son Nabucodrosor, and soon after made an assault upon Nineveh, in consequence of which Saracus set fire to his palace. Still more scanty is the notice of Alex. Polyhistor in *Eusebii chron. arm.* p. 20, that Sardanapalus, who ruled over the Chaldeans twenty-one years, sent auxiliaries to the prince and satrap of the Median nation, *videlicet ut filio suo Nabucodrossoro desponderet Amuhiam e filiabus Asdahagis unam.* That Polyh. here calls Nabopolassar Sardanapalus, has been already noticed by Syncellus (i. 396 ed. Dind.), who farther adds: οὗτος (Nabopolassar)

tered him at Megiddo (in the plain of Esdraelon, see above p. 48), Nechoh must have come by sea to Palestine and landed at Acco; comp. my apol. Vers. p. 436 f. This is confirmed by Herodotus, inasmuch as to the account that Nechoh built ships (*αἱ μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ βορηΐῃ θαλάσσῃ ἐποιήθησαν*—*naves in mare septentrionale s. mediterraneum mittendas cf.* Bähr *ad. h. l.*) he adds: *καὶ ταύτῃσί τε ἐχρᾶτο ἐν τῷ δέοντι· καὶ Σύροισι πεζῇ ὁ Νεκὼς συμβαλὼν ἐν Μαγδόλῳ ἐνίκησε* (ii. 159.) These words show, as Kalkar, Critical essay on the last times of kingdom of Judah in Pelt's theol. Mitarb. ii. 2, p. 79, has justly remarked, that the arrival was by sea, but the battle took place on land.—"He slew him at Megiddo, when he saw him." Cler. explains כִּרְאֹתוֹ אֹתוֹ rightly according to the sense, *prœlio cum eo commisso*, comp. xiv. 8, where the *hithp.* הִתְרָאָה is used in a similar sense. This brief notice of our verse is elucidated in the detailed narrative of this event in 2 Chr. xxxv. 21 f. by the fact, that Josiah, when he gave battle to Nechoh, notwithstanding his declaration that he should not contend with him, as he took the field, not against him, but against his hereditary foe (the Babylonian as heir of the Assyrian kingdom), was hit by the Egyptian archers and mortally wounded, so that when he was brought from his war chariot into his other chariot, and carried to Jerusalem, he expired by the way. The reason why Josiah did not desist from the war after such a declaration from Nechoh is not to be sought in this, that he was under the dominion of Babylon, but merely in the fact that he cherished the conviction that he could not remain neutral in the war that was breaking out

*στρατηγὸς ὑπὸ Σάρακος τοῦ Χαλδαίων βασιλέως σταλεὶς, κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σάρακος εἰς Νίνον ἐπιστρατεύει· οὗ τὴν ἔφοδον πτοηθεὶς ὁ Σάρακος ἑαυτὸν σὺν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἐνέπρησε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν Χαλδαίων καὶ Βαβυλῶνος παρέλαβεν ὁ αὐτὸς Ναβοπαλάσαρος, ὁ του Ναβουχοδονόσωρ πατήρ.* From these brief notices this at least is manifest, that Busalosor or Nabopolassar was a general of the last Assyrian king, and was sent by him to Babylon, but here joined with the Median prince, rebelled against his master, and by the conquest of Nineveh made an end of the Assyrian monarchy. Now, if the canon of Ptolemy represents Nabopolassar as among the Assyrian and Median kings, and, in accordance with Polyhistor, assigns to him twenty-one years, the beginning of his reign can only be placed in the year 625 B.C., coinciding with the end of the Assyrian monarchy, and therefore the conquest of Nineveh not later than this year.

between Babylon and Egypt, and perhaps hoped by the defeat and conquest of the Egyptians to avert further evil from his country and kingdom. For in the desire for conquest which distinguished the two nations, it was not difficult to foresee that the kingdom of Judah, lying between the two hostile powers, would inevitably be swallowed up by the conqueror. With this conviction Josiah took the field and sank under the Divine decree, to which reference is made in the words 2 Chr. xxxv. 22, "he hearkened not unto the words of Nechoh from the mouth of God."—Instead of Megiddo Herod. *l. c.* calls the place of the battle *Μάγδολον*, confounding the two names with one another, as with most expositors even Forbiger, Hdb. d. a. Geogr. ii. p. 695 thinks probable, but in p. 798 in contradiction with himself takes *Μάγδολον* to be the same with מִגְדֹּל, Ex. xiv. 2, situated twelve Roman miles south of Pelusium, and without reflecting on the impossibility of this assertion adds, that Nechoh there smote the Syrians.—The death of the pious Josiah was deeply lamented by his whole people; Jeremiah composed lamentations for him (2 Chr. xxxv. 24 f.), which however have not come down to us, and the mourning of the people was so great, that it was used as a proverb even after the exile to denote the deepest mourning, comp. Zech. xii. 11 and my apol. Vers. p. 432.—His younger son Jehoahaz was chosen[1] by the people as king in his stead, and because he was not the legitimate successor anointed as sovereign (comp. above p. 12.)

[1] Jeremiah calls king Jehoahaz (xxii. 11) Shallum, שַׁלֻּם, that is, the requited, in order to indicate the fortune that befell him. Jehoahaz, that is, he whom the Lord should hold, became a Shallum, one to whom the Lord had requited the evil of his doings, comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 540. This designation cannot therefore be regarded as the actual name borne by Jehoahaz. It is found indeed in 1 Chr. iii. 15, but there (v. 16) Jehoiachin also is mentioned only under the name Jechoniah applied to him by Jeremiah, and Josiah's sons Eliakim and Zedekiah; from which it is manifest, that the writer of Chronicles herein follows the prophet Jeremiah.

## CHAPTER XXIII. 31—XXIV. 17.

### REIGN OF KING JEHOAHAZ, VV. 31—35, OF JEHOIAKIM, V. 36—CH. XXIV. 7, AND JEHOIACHIN, VV. 8—17.

Vv. 31–35. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 1—4. Three months' reign of Jehoahaz. Why the people passed over Eliakim, who was twenty-five years of age, and elected Jehoahaz, the younger son of Josiah, who was twenty-three years old, king, is not mentioned, probably on account of his warlike character, by which they considered him better fitted to be sovereign than Jehoiakim. From Jer. xxii. 10—12 it appears, that the people formed great hopes of him, that they expected him as a vigorous sovereign to repel the danger threatening the kingdom from Pharoah, and on that account lamented very much his removal to Egypt. As sovereign he was not like his pious father, but followed the steps of the earlier untheocratic kings; "he did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, as all his fathers had done." The prophet Ezekiel compares him to a young lion, that learned to catch the prey and devoured men; but as soon as the nations heard of him, he was taken in their pit and brought with nose rings to Egypt (xix. 3 f.) and characterizes him as a tyrant inclined to deeds of violence; Josephus (Ant. x. 5, 2) designates him therefore as *ἀσεβὴς καὶ μιαρὸς τὸν τρόπον*.—V. 33. "And Pharaoh Nechoh put him in fetters at Riblah in the land of Hamath, when he was king in Jerusalem." Instead of this in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 3 it is, "And the king of Egypt removed him at Jerusalem." The contradiction which Schmeidler (d. Untergang des R. Juda. 1831, p. 58 ff.) observed between these two passages, Cler. *ad 2 Chr. l.c.* removed by the just remark: *Jerosolima prius amoveri oportuit Jehoachazum, quam in vincula conjici; nec quidquam vetat Jerosolimæ prius solio dejectum quam Riblam abductum.* The Masoretic change of בִּמְלֹךְ into מִמְּלֹךְ is an unnecessary conjecture; and בִּמְלֹךְ בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם is not to be explained with Cler. *dum Jerosolimitani eum pro rege haberent*, but

the strangeness of the expression arises from the unusal connection of the history, inasmuch as our author has omitted to state, that Nechoh came to Jerusalem and there removed Jehoahaz from the throne and seated on it his elder brother Jehoiakim. Many indeed have denied the taking of Jerusalem by Nechoh, but quite erroneously; for this event is not merely testified by 2 Chr. xxxvi. 3, but confirmed also by Herodotus,[1] and besides has in itself the highest degree of probability. For even if we were to assume with J. D. Mich. and others, that the elder brother Eliakim, dissatisfied with the election of Jehoahaz as king, had applied to Nechoh at Riblah to recover through him his paternal throne, yet Jehoahaz could not have been so foolish as at the mere command of Nechoh at Riblah to submit to the enemy of his country and abdicate the sovereignty, when he was perfectly safe in Jerusalem, because the people had raised him to the throne. If Pharaoh wished to interfere in the internal affairs of the kingdom of Judah, he would not proceed, after the battle of Megiddo, from Palestine to Syria, but must first at Jerusalem have deposed Jehoahaz, who was raised to the throne without his consent (comp. Kalk. i. p. q. p. 83.) We must, therefore, conceive the course of events somewhat thus: Nechoh, on the intelligence of the accession of Jehoahaz to the throne, and perhaps also in consequence of the complaint which Eliakim brought before him in regard to this matter, set out with a part of his forces to Jerusalem, while the remainder of his troops pursued their way at leisure towards Riblah, took Jerusalem and captured king Jehoahaz, laid a tribute on the country, raised Eliakim as his vassal to the throne, and on his departure brought Jehoahaz captive with him to Riblah, where he put him in chains and car-

[1] Comp. Herod. ii. 159: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην (the above mentioned battle at Megiddo) Κάδυτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίης ἐοῦσαν μεγάλην εἷλε. That Jerusalem is to be understood by Κάδυτις the most eminent modern theologians, philologists, and historians admit, the names of whom are enumerated in my apol. Vers. p. 434. I have there (p. 433—439) refuted both the opinion advocated by Hitzig in his *Dissert. de Cadyte urbe Herod. Gott.* 1829, that Κάδυτις denotes the Philistine city Gaza, and the conclusions drawn from it by this learned man and adopted by Schmeidler i. p. q. p. 54 ff. against the taking of Jerusalem by Nechoh, and I have not yet heard of any protest against this refutation.

ried him to Egypt.[1]—Riblah in the land of Hamath, situated according to Num. xxxiv. 11 on the north east border of Palestine, is preserved "in the present Riblah, a village ten or twelve hours S.S.W. of Hums (Emesa) on the river el Asy (Orontes) in the northern part of the great valley el Bukaa" (comp. Rob. Pal. iii. p. 747.) It thus lay on the great caravan road, which led from Palestine by Damascus, Emesa, and Hamath, to Thapsacus and Carchemish on the Euphrates, on which account, perhaps, Nebuchadnezzar made it his head-quarters in his last expedition against Judea, comp. xxv. 6, 20, 21; Jer. xxxix. 5, lii. 10.—A hundred talents of silver are, according to Bertheau's computation, 261,800 pr. rixd. (about £34,217); a talent of gold, according to Michaelis' reckoning, amounts to 4412 ducats (about £5475.)—V. 34. "And Pharaoh Nechoh made Eliakim, the son of Josiah, king in the room of Josiah his father." These last words indicate that Nechoh did not acknowledge the sovereignty of Jehoahaz, namely, because he was elected by the people without his concurrence. "And turned his name to Jehoiakim." The change of name is a sign of dependence of the loss of his freedom. In ancient times princes were wont to give the persons who entered into their services, as masters their slaves, new names, comp. Gen. xli. 45; Ezr. v. 14; Dan. i. 7, and the documents quoted by Havern. on this passage. But whereas heathen princes were fond of giving those who entered into their service as slaves heathen names after their deities, Eliakim and Mattaniah (xxiv. 17) receive the purely Israelitish names Jehoiakim, Jehovah will establish, and Zidkijahu, the righteousness of Jehovah. Hence we may infer with certainty that Nechoh and Nebuchadnezzar treated the vassal kings appointed by them not altogether as slaves, but permitted them to choose themselves the new names, which they only confirmed in token of their supre-

[1] The older expositors mostly assumed that Nechoh, after the battle of Megiddo, advanced without delay to the Euphrates, and took Carchemish, and only on his return thence came to Jerusalem, deposed Jehoahaz, and appointed Jehoiakim king. But the improbability, indeed impossibility, of this assumption has been shown by J. D. Mich., who pointed out, that Carchemish was from 400 to 500 miles from Megiddo, so that within three months an army could not possibly make its way thither, conquer the fenced city Carchemish, and then march back a still greater distance to Jerusalem and take this city.

macy. On the change of Eliakim (God will establish) into Jehoiakim, Hengstenb. (Christol. iii. p. 540) aptly remarks, that Eliakim so changed the name given him by his father with reference to the promise 2 Sam. vii. 12, "and I will establish (וַהֲקִימֹתִי) thy seed after thee," etc., that he put it in still closer connection with the promise in which not El but Jehovah is expressly named as the promiser, and adopted this change not from piety but out of opposition to the sentence of the prophets concerning the impending fall of the royal house of David.—V. 35. In order to raise the tribute demanded by Nechoh Jehoiakim laid a tax on the land and exacted of the people, according to the assessment of each, the requisite silver and gold. הֶעֱרִיךְ means here to assess, as Lev. xxvii. 8, 12. נָגַשׂ to press, to exact a debt or payment from any one, *cum acc. pers.* Deut. xv. 3, is here at the same time construed *cum acc. rei.*

V. 36—Ch. xxiv. 7. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 5—8. Reign of Jehoiakim; first invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. V. 36. Rumah the place, from which Zebidah the mother of Jehoiakim came, is quite unknown; perhaps רוּמָה is the same with אֲרוּמָה (Judg. ix. 41) in the neighbourhood of Shechem.—V. 37. Jehoiakim as regent is characterized like Jehoahaz (v. 32); whence we perceive that they shared the same ungodly disposition; Jehoahaz only failed in time to display his ungodliness on the throne, as Jehoiakim did during his reign of eleven years, whom Jeremiah, xxii. 13 ff., characterizes as an unrighteous prince enriching himself by the unjust oppression of his people, "whose eyes and heart were directed to nothing but gain and innocent blood to shed it, and to oppression and violence to do it;" comp. xxiv. 4, and Jer. xxvi. 22 f. Josephus designates him accordingly as τὴν φύσιν ἄδικος καὶ κακοῦργος, καὶ μήτε πρὸς Θεὸν ὅσιος, μήτε πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιεικής (Ant. x. 5, 2).

Ch. xxiv. 1. "In his days Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came up, and Jehoiakim became subject to him three years; then he revolted again from him." Henceforward the accounts in our narrative, as well as in Chronicles, are extremely concise, being limited to that which is indispensably necessary to represent the fall of the kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar, written נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר or נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר Jer. xxi. 2, 7, xxii. 25, etc., *Ναβουχοδονόσορ*

LXX. *Ναβουχοδονόσορος* in Berosus in Joseph. Ant. x. 11, 1, and still otherwise, according to the explanation of Gesenius, *Mercurii rex princeps* (comp. on the different orthographies and explanations of the name Ges. *thes.* ii. 840), was the son of Nabopolassar, the founder of the Chaldee monarchy, and reigned, according to Berosus in *Josephi c. Ap.* i. 20, Alex. Polyh. in *Eusebii Chron. arm.* p. 21, and the canon of Ptolemy, forty-three years, from 604 to 561 B.C. His campaign against Jehoiakim here recorded falls in the fourth year of the latter's reign, that is, 606 B.C., thus properly before the beginning of his reign. This appears from Jer. xxv. 1, comp. with xlvi. 2, and from Berosus. The prophet Jeremiah xxv. announces the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar in such a manner that it must have taken place in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, comp. my apol. Vers. p. 21 f. In the same year, according to Jer. xlvi. 2, Nebuchadnezzar totally defeated the Egyptian king Nechoh at Carchemish (Circesium) on the Euphrates. But Berosus relates in a passage quoted by Joseph. (*Ant.* x. 11, 1, and *c. Ap.* i. 19), that Nabopolassar, on the intelligence of the revolt of his satraps over Egypt, Cœlesyria and Phenicia, being no longer able from age to bear the hardships of war, made over a part of his army to his still youthful son, and sent him against them; that Nebuchadnezzar conquered them in battle, and reduced this country again under his dominion; that, meanwhile, Nabopolassar fell sick and died in Babylon, whereupon Nebuchadnezzar, on receiving intelligence of his death, hastened with a few followers through the wilderness to Babylon, and ordered his army, after regulating the affairs of Egypt and the other countries, to follow at leisure with the prisoners and heavy troops. From this narrative, notwithstanding much unhistorical embellishment,[1] thus much is

[1] To these embellishments belongs, for example, the motive assigned for this expedition of Nebuchadnezzar, the revolt of the satraps placed over Egypt, Cœlesyria and Phenicia, inasmuch as Berosus here, according to the just remark of J. D. Mich., "speaks the arrogant language of the annals of the Asiatic monarchies, who regard all other nations as subjects, as the Chinese, if perchance a European embassy arrive, notify in their annals that they paid tribute." With this compare what Hengstenb. (Beitr. i. p. 103 ff.) has remarked upon the encomiastic character of the accounts of Berosus concerning the Chaldeans and Nebuchadnezzar in particular. To take statements of a

elicited as certain fact, that Nebuchadnezzar, before the death of his father, not merely defeated the Egyptians, but penetrated to the borders of Egypt. But that in this first expedition against hither Asia, which was terminated by the intelligence of his father's decease, he also took Jerusalem, appears partly from Dan. i. 1 ff., partly from our verse and the parallel passage, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6.[1] For without the taking of Jerusalem he could not make king Jehoiakim his subject, still less bind him in chains in order to carry him to Babylon. Farther, that the taking of the city occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim and not later, we do not require to prove from Dan. i. 1 ff., especially as this passage is not pointed enough for this purpose, because here, probably according to a somewhat different computation of the years of Jehoiakim's reign, the third year of this king is named as the

similar kind, that are in contradiction with otherwise accredited facts, for historical truth, and with Schroeer (*regn. Babyl.* p. 289 ff.) and others to form conjectures concerning these satraps, or with Winer (R.W. ii. p. 169) to assume on this account a defect in history, is to misapprehend the spirit of the old extra-biblical historians, who uniformly proceed upon the principle of glorifying their heroes at the expense of historical truth. Hengstenb. i. p. q., and in his *comment. de reb. Tyr.* p. 35 f., has collected abundant proofs of this. To the unhistorical exaggerations belongs also the notice of the regulating of the affairs of Egypt, which was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar at a much later period.

[1] This passage indeed (2 Chr. xxxvi. 6) is referred by many ancient and modern expositors, even by Kalkar, i. p. q. p. 89, to the second expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jehoiakim, but quite erroneously. For this reference, even without regard to the consideration that his first expedition against Judah, with which the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah began, would not in that case be mentioned in Chronicles, which cannot be conceived possible on account of 2 Chr. xxxvi. 21, is proved to be false by this, that Nebuchadnezzar came no more to Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's lifetime, but the second time only under Jehoiachin. The correct view of our passage is found among others in Schroeer, who, *l.c.* p. 282 f., has thus simply collected the various biblical statements: *Vix propheta Jeremias Jehojakimo, a Pharaone Neco in solium evecto, periculum a Nebucadnezare imminere prœnunciaverat (c. 25), cum ille eodem adhuc anno adveniens regnum Judaicum sub jugum mitteret. Equidem Nebucadnezar regem catenis vinctum ad perpetuos carceres damnaverat, pactis tamen servitutis conditionibus, mutata sententia eundem in regnum utcunque restituebat, nonnullis saltem ex sobole regia cum vasis sacris Babylonem abductis* (2 *Reg.* xxiv. 1 *sqq.*, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 6 *sqq.* With this comp. also my apol. Vers. p. 24 and 440 f.

year of the conquest; on the contrary, it follows from the natural course of events. After the defeat of Nechoh at Circesium Nebuchadnezzar would no doubt avail himself of his advantage pursue the fleeing enemy, and forthwith subject to himself the countries occupied by them, among which Judea was included. But for the march from Circesium to Jerusalem he required at most only two or three months, so that he might very well conquer Jerusalem in the same year in which he defeated the Egyptians at Carchemish. This probability is made a certainty by Jer. xxxvi. 9. The fast proclaimed according to this passage in the ninth month of the fifth year of Jehoiakim, to which all the people came from the cities of Judah to Jerusalem, was instituted for no other purpose than to commemorate the taking of Jerusalem the year before, with which the seventy years' Babylonian servitude of the Jews commenced, as also after the exile the anniversaries of the various great catastrophes in the fall of the kingdom of Judah were observed as fasts (comp. Zech. vii. 3--5, viii. 19, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 426.)[1] Jerusalem therefore was taken the first time by Nebuchadnezzar in the ninth month of the 4th year of Jehoiakim, that is, in December 606 B.C.[2] Comp. also Hengstenb. Beitr. i. p. 52 ff., and my apol. Vers, p. 19 ff.

[1] The supposition of Hitzig, Begr. d. Krit. p. 183, Schmeidler i. p. q. p. 84, Maurer on Jer. xxxvi. 9, and Winer, R.W. i. p. 700, that this fast was proclaimed from fear of the army of the Chaldeans when first approaching, I have already refuted in my apol. Vers. p. 25.

[2] Following Josephus (*Ant.* x. 6—1) Winer, R.W. i. p. 700, and ii. p. 170, and Kalkar i. p. q. p. 88 f. assume, that Nebuchadnezzar in his first progress did not touch Judea, but first invaded this land four years later, and made Jehoiakim subject to him. But this statement of Josephus is founded on no historical source now accessible to us, but merely on an erroneous exposition of the passages in Kings and Chronicles which relate to the point in question. The date, "in the fourth" year of Nebuchadnezzar, which was the eighth of Jehoiakim," Josephus has drawn from vv. 1—6 of our chapter, compared with 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, and Jer. xxii. 19. For as from the prediction of Jeremiah (xxii. 19), that Jehoiakim should be buried as an ass, etc., he drew the conclusion, that Jehoiakim was slain by Nebuchadnezzar, and his body thrown over the city walls and left unburied, he was compelled to assume farther, that Jehoiakim rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar only at the end of his reign, according to which his subjection, if it lasted only three years, must have commenced in the eighth year of his reign. But how far Josephus is from inspiring confidence in these historical averments, which are in contradiction with Old Testament statements,

Vv. 2, 3. In order to punish the apostasy of Jehoiakim, the Lord sent bands of the Chaldees, Aramaeans, Moabites, and Ammonites against him, and against Judah to destroy it (לְהַאֲבִידוֹ.) From these words it is clear that Nebuchadnezzar himself was not in a position to punish the rebellion of Jehoiakim against his authority, at least immediately, probably because he was too much occupied with other affairs of the kingdom in the first years of his reign after his father's death. He therefore sent merely the forces that were in the neighbourhood of Judah against Jehoiakim. The hostile bands named, beside the Chaldees, were all perhaps already dependent on Nebuchadnezzar, so that they attacked Judah at his command in conjunction with the Chaldean troops that were left on the borders. How much

and how much rather these averments always rest on erroneous combinations and conclusions, an unprejudiced criticism will, it is to be hoped, sooner or later come to be convinced, and will cease to award to the utterly uncritical Josephus the preference over the biblical writers. The Old Testament writers know nothing of the slaying of Jehoiakim by Nebuchadnezzar, nothing of an expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against him in the eleventh year of his reign (comp. my apol. Vers. p. 440), but relate that after Jehoiakim's revolt from the king of Babylon, the latter sent Chaldee, Aramaean, and other troops against him, but that Jehoiakim slept with his fathers, and his son Jehoiakim succeeded him on the throne, and that Nebuchadnezzar himself only in the beginning of Jehoiachin's reign advanced the second time against Jerusalem, conquered the city, and carried away to Babylon the king with his family, his nobles, the warriors and smiths (2 Ki. xxiv. 2—17); whereas Josephus fabulously reports that Nebuchadnezzar, after the slaying of Jehoiakim, carried away 3000 captives, among whom was Ezekiel, to Babylon, and appointed Jehoiakim's son Jehoiachin as king, but soon after repenting of this, sent a new army to Jerusalem and took Jehoiachin captive, and brought him to Babylon (*Ant.* x. 6—3 and 7—1.)—The statement of Josephus, that Nebuchadnezzar in his first campaign against hither Asia after the defeat of the Egyptians at the Euphrates did not touch Judea, but only took τὴν ἄχρι Πηλουσίου Συρίαν παρὲξ τῆς Ἰουδαίας is also contradicted by the account of Berosus quoted by Josephus himself in another place, and given above, inasmuch as Berosus not only knows nothing of this exception of Judah, but even expressly says, that Nebuchadnezzar carried away to Babylon τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Φοινίκων καὶ Σύρων καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐθνῶν; with which captives Ἰουδαίων Kalkar knows not what to do, and, contrary to all historic probability, wishes to understand the words of Jews who were compelled to serve in Nechoh's army.

they accomplished, however, is not definitely stated; but from the circumstance that after the death of Jehoiakim his son Jehoiachin ascended the throne (v. 6) this much may be inferred as certain, that they had not been able to conquer Jerusalem. But this chastisement was only a fulfilment of the Divine sentence pronounced by the prophets on the land and people of Judah for their sins; comp. v. 2 (end) and v. 3 with xxi. 10—15 and xxiii. 26 f. The sending of these enemies is therefore ascribed to Jehovah, who, as the supreme disposer of the destiny of the theocracy, punished Jehoiakim for his apostasy. For after Judah was given over by the Lord into the hands of the Chaldeans for the punishment of his apostasy and his surrender to the principles of heathenism, every rebellion against them appears as a rebellion against the Lord, which he punishes. Comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 500.—V. 4. Comp. xxi. 16. "And Jehovah would not pardon," namely, because the mass of the people, as is abundantly evident from the prophecies of the contemporary Jeremiah, were incorrigible, and could only be purified by the calamities of the exile, and the remnant brought to repentance. God therefore would (אָבָה) not and could not alter the decree for the rejection of Judah from his sight (xxiii. 27) because it rested on his very being, on his holiness and righteousness. God could not turn his heart to the godless people, even if the greatest intercessors, Moses and Samuel, had appeared before him (Jer. xv. 1 ff.)—V. 6. That the statement, "Jehoiakim slept with his fathers," is not inconsistent with the prediction, Jer. xxii. 19, "Jehoiakim will be buried like an ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem," and xxxvi. 30, "his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the cold," is acknowledged even by Winer (R.W. i. p. 701), inasmuch as, approving of the conjecture offered by J. D. Mich. on 1 Chr. xxxvi. 6, he thinks that the maltreatment of the body of Jehoiakim announced by the prophet may have been practised on the remains of the hated king in the conquest of Jerusalem, that took place three months later, either by the conquerors out of revenge for his revolt, or perhaps even by his own subjects. But it is also possible, and perhaps still more probable, that Jehoiakim met with his death in a battle with the hostile forces

sent against him, and did not come to the grave, but was left lying unburied (comp. my apol. Vers. p. 441 f.): in which case still his son Jehoiachin might ascend the throne unimpeded, as Jerusalem was still in possession of the Jews.—V. 7. The notice concerning the Egyptian king Nechoh is given here according to S. Schm., *ut indicaretur casus Jojakimi; Jojakimus scil. fiducia Aegyptiorum rebellavit adversus Babylonium, et eos sibi venturos auxilio speravit, sed frustra.* In the highest degree improbable, as Nechoh had hitherto proved himself not the friend and ally but the foe of Judah. Much rather is the account, that Nechoh proceeded no more out of his land, because Nebuchadnezzar had taken from him all the territory from the brook of Egypt to the river Euphrates (which he had conquered), given, because Pharaoh's march to the Euphrates had been previously mentioned, and the reader at least expected an indication as to how Nechoh acted on the taking of Judah by the Chaldeans. The words moreover apply to Nechoh; for even if his immediate successor Psammis attempted nothing, yet Apries (Pharaoh Hophra) again endeavoured to make conquests and come to the aid of Zedekiah against the Chaldeans besieging Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvii. 5, xliv. 30; Ezek. xvii. 15—17.)

Vv. 8—17. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9, 10. The three months' reign of Jehoiachin, removal of the king with his mother, his wives, his courtiers, and the most powerful portion of the nation to Babylon.—V. 8. In the eighteenth year of his life (not the eighth, as it stands in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 9 by an error of transcription), Jehoiachin[1] ascended the throne and held it only three months and two days (2 Chr. xxxvi. 9), as he pursued the ungodly principles of his father, "did that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that his father had done" (v. 9.) Schmeidler indeed i. p. q. p. 108, and Kalkar i. p. q. p. 91, have asserted the contrary of his character. Jeremiah, says Schmeid-

[1] This name standing in obvious relation with 2 Sam. vii. 12 (וַהֲכִינֹתִי), Jeremiah changes into the equivalent form Jechoniah (Jer. xxiv. 1, xxvii. 20, xxviii. 4) in order to make from it the form Coniah (xxii. 24—28, xxxvii. 1) and thereby indicate the fate awaiting this sovereign. "The future is prefixed in order to be able to cut off hope by the aphæresis of the י, a Jechoniah without J, a God-will-establish without *will.* Comp. Hengstenb. Christ. iii. p. 541.

ler, considers Jehoiachin by no means so bad, as the authors of the second books of Kings and Chronicles do, and Kalkar remarks: "To this sovereign, who is also called Jechoniah and Coniah (Jer. xxii. 23) Josephus bears witness, that he was φύσει χρηστὸς ὢν καὶ δίκαιος; and also several intimations of sacred scripture speak for the excellent gifts of the prince, but he did not answer the expectations awakened by his gifts." But from the circumstance that he is compared, Jer. xxii. 24, to a signet ring, the most precious among the possessions of an Eastern man, and that the unbelieving Jews ask (v. 28), "is Coniah a despised broken vessel?" that does not follow, which Josephus inferred from it, that he was φύσει χρηστὸς καὶ δίκαιος. The entirely hypothetical asseveration, "As I live, saith the Lord, though Coniah were the signet on my right hand, yet would I pluck him thence," says nothing of the character of Jechoniah, neither that he was bad, nor that he was good; but contains merely the irrevocable Divine sentence of his being rejected and given over to the Chaldeans; and the question of the unbelieving Jews can prove still less, first, because it comes from unbelievers, and next, because it only expresses their astonishment at the ignominious lot that is announced to him. That Jehoiachin was no better than he is described in the historical books, appears from Ezek. xix. 5—7, where he is not only depicted like Jehoahaz as a young lion, who learned to catch the prey and devoured men, but at the same time it is said of him that he knew, that is, violated their widows (those of the slain) and laid waste their cities, that he, as Hävern. on the passage p. 303 has rightly determined the meaning of the words, "did not confine his violence merely to single acts of oppression, but extended it to the inheritance of the slain, the widows and all their circumstances, the cities where they dwelt.—V. 10 ff. בָּעֵת הַהִיא, that is, during the three months' reign of Jehoiachin, in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 10, the time is more exactly determined, לִתְשׁוּבַת הַשָּׁנָה, that is, in the beginning of the year, in the spring (comp. above p. 285), whence we at the same time perceive, that Jehoiachin ascended the throne in the last months of the year. The *kethibh* עָלָה needs no alteration, as the verb often stands in the singular before the plural subject, see Ew. Gr. § 567.—The עַבְדֵי נְבֻכ׳

are different from the גְּדוּדִים (v. 2); Nebuchadnezzar now sent his generals with an army to Jerusalem, to besiege it, and shortly after the siege was begun followed himself to punish the revolt of Jehoiakim in his son and successor. V. 12. וַיֵּצֵא "Jehoiachin went out," that is, surrendered, *potestati ejus se commisit* (Seb. Schm.) Older expositors, as C. a Lap., Seb. Schm. think that Jechoiachin took this step *suadente Jeremia, ne Hierosolima everteretur.* Possible, but not probable, on account of Jer. xxii. 25—27, and by no means proved by Jer. xxxviii. 2. Thus much only is certain, that Jehoiachin, perceiving the impossibility of being able long to withstand the Chaldee besieging army, hoped by a voluntary surrender to gain the favour of the enemy and perhaps to retain the throne as vassal. But Nebuchadnezzar no longer exercised grace, as on the first taking of Jerusalem towards Jehoiakim, but took the king captive and carried him with his family to Babylon, as Jeremiah (xxii. 24 ff.) had already predicted to him under Jehoiakim.—That immediately after the king his mother Nehushta is mentioned in v. 12 among those going out to Nebuchadnezzar, and v. 13 among those carried to Babylon, occurs not because she had the guardianship of the king not yet come of age (Mich., Der., and others), but because she as הַגְּבִירָה (Jer. xxix. 2), that is, Sultana Validé, held a very influential position in the kingdom (comp. p. 219 f.) וַיִּקַּח אֹתוֹ "he took him (Jehoiachin) captive." The eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign is computed from the time when his father made over to him the supreme command of the army for the war with Nechoh, according to which his first year coincides with the fourth of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxv. 1.) Because Nebuchadnezzar henceforth appears before the Jews as king, though at first only acting in his father's name, the beginning of his reign is always computed from this point of time in our books and in Jeremiah, comp. besides our passage xxv. 8; Jer. xxxii. 1, and his reign, according to this computation, amounts to 44—45 years, comp. xxv. 27, and Hitzig on Jer. xxv. 1.—V. 13. After Nebuchadnezzar had taken Jehoiachin captive, and as we must assume entered the city, he plundered the treasures of the temple and the palace, and cut up the golden vessels made by Solomon, that is, separated the

golden plating from them: comp. on קִצֵּץ the remarks on xvi. 17. On the first taking of Jerusalem in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar had seized a portion of the golden vessels of the temple and placed them in the temple of his god at Babylon. These were obviously the smaller vessels of solid gold, basins, dishes, cups, knives, tongs, and the like, perhaps also the golden candlesticks; comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 7, Dan. i. 2, which Cyrus again delivered to the Jews when returning to the land of their fathers (Ezr. i. 7 ff.) Nebuchadnezzar, therefore, now took the gold from the larger articles, which were only plated with this metal, as the altar of incense, the table of shew bread, the ark of the covenant, and carried it away as spoil, so that in the last conquest of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, except some gold and silver basins and dishes (comp. xxv. 15), only the larger brazen or copper vessels of the court were left (xxv. 13—17; Jer. xxvii. 18 ff.)—The words, "as Jehovah had ordered," refer particularly to xx. 7 and Is. xxxix. 6, but at the same time also to the sentence of other prophets, as Jer. xv. 13 and xvii. 3.—V. 14—16. Besides these treasures he carried away the best part of the nation, not only the strongest in body and mind, but as may be perceived from Jer. xxiv., the best of the people even in a moral point of view, to Babylon. Those carried away are first in v. 14 stated as a total sum of 10,000, and then specified in vv. 15 and 16, the king, with his mother and his wives, his ministers (סָרִיסָיו), and the heads of the people, without stating the number; farther, the warriors 7000 men, finally, the forgers and locksmiths 1000 men, so that 10,000 are obtained, if we reckon the number of the courtiers and heads of the people at 2000. So is this verse rightly understood by most interpreters; for the words כָּל־הַשָּׂרִים and כָּל־גִּבּוֹרֵי הַחַיִל (v. 14) correspond to אוּלֵי הָאָרֶץ (v. 15) and כָּל־אַנְשֵׁי הַחַיִל (v. 16) and the words הֶחָרָשׁ וְהַמַּסְגֵּר (v. 14) recur in v. 16. גבורי החיל and אנשי החיל are not rich and wealthy, but warriors, soldiers. The שָׂרִים princes, heads of tribes and families, are called as the representatives and heads of the people אוּלֵי הָאָרֶץ "the potentates of the land." Among these are perhaps also included the priests and prophets not specially named here, but according to Jer. xxix. 1 carried

away at the same time, Ezekiel for instance (Ezek. i. 1 f.), as the spiritual overseers of the people. For the unusual form אוּלֵי the Masoretes have substituted the more usual אֵילֵי (comp. Ex. xv. 15; Ezek. xvii. 13.) כָּל־יְרוּשָׁלַם that is, the whole body of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, is first more exactly defined by enumerating the various classes of inhabitants, and then limited by the addition, "nothing was left save דַּלַּת עַם־הָאָרֶץ the weak and insignificant populace," from which Nebuchadnezzar apprehended no new rebellion. הַכֹּל גִּבּוֹרִים עֹשֵׂי מִלְחָמָה forms the contrast to דַּלַּת עַם הָאָרֶץ, as v. 16, all that were carried away to Babylon, not merely the heads of the people with the king, his family and courtiers, and the warriors, but even the forgers and locksmiths are included in it. עֹשֵׂי מִלְחָמָה therefore denotes here not engaged in war, but as de Wette has rightly rendered, fit for service. חָרָשׁ denotes the labourers and artizans in stone, metal and wood (comp. Ges. *thes. s.v.*), and therefore includes carpenters, smiths, and masons; and it is very possible, that Nebuchadnezzar removed all those operatives, who could lend effectual aid to a new rebellion. But especially would he look after the smiths, who could forge arms. For this reason, and on account of the combination of חָרָשׁ with מַסְגֵּר I have preferred the rendering forgers. So also de Wette renders here, but in Jer. xxiv. 1, and xxix. 2, carpenters. מַסְגֵּר denotes neither *janitores* (תרעיא Chald.), nor *mercatores* (Cler.), still less *viros doctos, qui aliis obturant os et ea proponunt, quae ab aliis solvi nequeunt* (Kimchi), but the locksmith, *claustrarium, qui claustra et pessulos facit* (Gesen.)—V. 17. Over the feeble people left behind, Nebuchadnezzar appointed Mattaniah the youngest son of Josiah (comp. Jer. i. 3, xxxvii. 1, and our remarks on v. 8) and uncle of the captive, Jehoiachin, king under the name of Zedekiah. With regard to the change of name comp. on xxiii. 34. צִדְקִיָּהוּ the righteousness of Jehovah denotes him under whose reign the Lord will impart righteousness to his people. Mattaniah selected for himself this with distinct reference to the Jehovah tsidkenu announced by Jeremiah xxiii.; comp. Hengstenb. Christol. iii. p. 560.

## CHAPTER XXIV. 18—20 & XXV.

REIGN OF ZEDEKIAH, AND FALL OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH, CH. XXIV. 18, XXV. 26. SUBSEQUENT FATE OF JEHOIACHIN, VV. 27—30.

To this section ch. lii. of Jeremiah affords a parallel agreeing for the most part to a word. In Jer. lii. is wanting only the account of the murder of Gedaliah, and the flight of the people left in the land to Egypt (2 Ki. xxv. 22—26), instead of which a survey of the Jews, carried by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, is given (vv. 28—30.) Concerning the mutual relation of the two narratives, three different opinions prevail. Some assume that Jer. lii. is a historical appendix to the predictions of this prophet taken by the compiler of them, as far as the passage, vv. 28—30, from our 2d Book of Kings (Grot., Rosenm., Maur. on Jer., Bertholdt Einl. iv. p. 1475 f., Herbst Einl. ii. 2, p. 55, and Welte in the same place). This hypothesis proves itself inadmissible and erroneous, first, because it does not know what to do with vv. 28—30, next, because, irrespective of all minor deviations, the text of Jeremiah, especially in vv. 19—23, is much fuller than vv. 15—17 in our book, and in the description of the brazen pillars of the temple contains several particulars, which are nowhere found in our Books of Kings, neither 2 Ki. xxv. 13—17, nor in the description of Solomon's temple, 1 Ki. vii. 15—22. Comp. also Jer. lii. 10 and 11 with 2 Ki. xxv. 7.—Others assume, that the section was originally appended by Jeremiah himself to his predictions, and admitted by him also into our Books of Kings, which were composed by him (Carpzov *introd.* iii. p. 152, ed. 2, and Hävern. Einl. ii. 1, p. 172 f.). To this assumption, which is advocated particularly by Hävern., it is chiefly objected that too great an age must be assigned to Jeremiah, if he wrote the last verses of this section, which record events of the time of Evilmerodach (561—559 B.C.), and Hävern. at present (see Einl. ii. 2, p. 248) finds this objection so weighty, that he is inclined to regard the verses 31—34, as an addition of the transcriber of this chapter. But this expedient is a mere evasion, and the assertion that vv. 28—30 (Jer.) decidedly form

the original proper close of the chapter, is neither proved by Häv. nor capable of proof. And, irrespective of these verses, the 52nd chapter of Jeremiah, in the state in which it has come down to us, cannot be a work of the prophet. For Jeremiah, if he wrote the history of the fall of the kingdom of Judah, could not possibly omit the removal of the principal part of the nation, the 10,000 men with Jehoiachin (2 Ki. xxiv. 14 ff.), and instead of this, mention three small partial removals, in which the sum of all that were removed amounted to 4600 souls.[1] Farther, we can see no reason why Jeremiah, after he had described the conquest of Jerusalem at large in chapter xxxix., should have here again described the same event much more briefly. Finally, if the prophet had composed the shorter description originally for our Books of Kings, he would not have prepared it again for the collection of his predictions, in order to give, instead of the history of Gedaliah, a quite incomplete survey of the various removals of the people to Babylon. As little could a collector of the predictions of Jeremiah borrow the 52nd chapter from our 2nd Book of Kings for the reasons already assigned. Thus there remains only the assumption that the two narratives are abstracts made by different persons from a common larger source, either from the annals of the kingdom, as Jahn (Einl. ii. 2, p. 565) thinks, or from another great work of a prophet, perhaps even from a more extended description of the last days of the kingdom of Judah, composed by Jeremiah or Baruch, analogous to the

[1] As of the three deportations mentioned Jer. lii. 28—30, the first is placed in the seventh, the second in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, neither can the one be identified with the removal of the most important part of the nation with Jehoiachin, which, according to 2 Ki. xxiv. 12, happened in the eighth year, nor the other, with the deportation after the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred, according to 2 Ki. xxv. 8, in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar. For the assumption of a different computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign in Jer. lii. is a very poor resource, by which on the one hand the difficulties of the verses in question are not at all removed, and on the other, a contradiction is introduced into the chapter itself, as in v. 12, the usual computation of the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign already mentioned in the explanation of v. 12 of our chapter, occurs. Moreover, it scarcely needs to be remarked, that even on the supposition of this wholly inadmissible assumption the chapter in question cannot have been written by Jeremiah.

two abstracts of the history of Hezekiah in 2 Ki. xviii., xx., and Is. xxxvi., xxxix. Comp. here also the general introduction.

Vv. 18—20. Comp. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 11—13, and Jer. lii. 1—3. Reign of Zedekiah; his revolt from the king of Babylon. If Zedekiah, the son of Josiah by Hamital (comp. v. 18 with xxiii. 31), and thus full brother of Jehoahaz and half-brother of Jehoiakim, ascended the throne at the age of twenty-one, 11½ years after Jehoahaz, he was 13½ years younger than the latter, who became king in his twenty-third year, and the youngest of the four sons of Josiah, whereas 1 Chron. iii. 15, Zedekiah is represented as the third, and Shallum, that is, Jehoahaz, as the fourth son of Josiah.—V. 19. Zedekiah's conduct as king is characterized as in every respect like that of Jehoiakim. This however does not imply, that he was guilty of all the particular sins of Jehoiakim; for, according to Jer. xxxviii. 5, 24 ff., he appears to have been of a weak character and entirely led by the nobles of his kingdom, without the courage to resist them, but the state of his heart towards God was the same as that of Jehoiakim; like the latter, he turned not to the word of the Lord, "he humbled not himself before Jeremiah the prophet, who spoke to him from the mouth of the Lord, he also rebelled against king Nebuchadnezzar, who had made him swear by God, and was stiffnecked and hardened his heart, so that he did not turn to the Lord the God of Israel" (2 Chr. xxxvi. 12 f.). Zedekiah with his servants and the whole people is similarly delineated in Jer. xxxvii. 2, and Ezekiel (xvii. 13 ff.) rebukes in sharp terms his covenant-breaking and thoughtless violation of oath, as a grievous transgression against the Lord.—V. 20. "For through the anger of Jehovah came this on Jerusalem and Judah, until he cast them out from his presence." The subject to הָיְתָה is undetermined, and is to be derived from what precedes, namely, the evil-doing of Zedekiah, as S. Schm. has observed and so correctly determined the sense: *Non quod a Deo fuerit, ut Zedekias malus esset, sed ut Zedekias homo, si Brentio h. l. credimus, simplex, a consiliariis dependens, verbum tamen simul Dei contemnens et impœnitens* (2 Chr. xxxvi. 12 sq.) *fieret rex, futurus causa excidii Hierosolymitani.* With regard to the phrase, to cast from his sight, comp. on xvii. 23. "And Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." From the very first Zedekiah does not seem

to have had very sincere intentions of fidelity to the oath sworn to Nebuchadnezzar. For not long after his institution into the office of king he despatched an embassy to Babylon (Jer. xxix. 3), which, if we may judge from the contents of the letter to the exiles entrusted by Jeremiah to the ambassadors, could scarcely have any other object than to effect the return of those carried away by the king of Babylon. Afterwards, in the fourth year of his reign, he himself set out for Babylon (Jer. li. 59), obviously with the view of releasing himself if possible from the Chaldean dependence which was imposed upon him. And after his return in the fifth month of the same year (comp. Jer. xxvii. 3 with xxviii. 1) appear ambassadors of the Moabites, Ammonites, Tyrians, and Sidonians to conclude with him an alliance to shake off the Babylonian yoke. Farther Zedekiah turned to Egypt, and, finally, notwithstanding the warning predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, relying on the aid of the enterprising Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), Ezek. xvii. 15, revolted from the king of Babylon perhaps in the eighth or beginning of the ninth year of his reign.

Chap. xxv. Vv. 1—7. Comp. Jer. xxxix. 1, 7, 8, lii. 4—11. Siege and conquest of Jerusalem; flight, capture, blinding and carrying of Zedekiah to Babylon.—V. 1. As soon as Nebuchadnezzar received the news of Zedekiah's revolt, he certainly was not long in taking measures of revenge. In the ninth year of Zedekiah, on the tenth day of the tenth month, he arrived at Jerusalem with his army, and, by erecting towers round about the city, commenced the siege, which lasted to the fourth month of the eleventh year, and, therefore a year and a half. Comp. Ezek. xxiv. 1, where the day of the commencement of the siege was revealed to this prophet in the exile, and Jer. xxxix. 1 and 2, where the beginning and end of it are stated in accordance with our verse and Jer. lii. 4—6. During the siege the Egyptian king Hophra marched to the aid Zedekiah. On the intelligence of this Nebuchadnezzar broke up with his army from Jerusalem to march against him, and drove him back to his own country, without, it appears, having come to an engagement with him (Jer. xxxvii. 5 ff.; Ezek. xvii. 17.)—At the same time with Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar also besieged the fenced cities Lachish and Azekah, while all the other cites of

Judah were already taken (Jer. xxxiv. 7.) דָּיֵק a late word occurring only in Jer. and Ezek. from the root דּוּק *speculari, prospicere,* denotes a watchtower, and stands here in a collective sense. The signification assigned to it by Mich. and defended by Hitzig on Jer. lii. 4, line of circumvallation, περίτειχος (LXX.) cannot be etymologically justified; see Ges. *thes.* i. 330, and Häv. on Ezek. p. 49 f.—That Jerusalem could stand a siege of eighteen months is to be ascribed less to the courage and strength of the Jewish army than to its own strong fortifications. For even if in the removal of the best of the nation under and with Jehoiachin many brave men had escaped the deportation by flight and rallied again under Zedekiah, yet the Jewish kingdom was so weakened by the captivity that it could never have resisted the Chaldean army, had it not found its greatest protection in the strong walls of Jerusalem, which was fortified even by its situation. Trusting thereto Zedekiah also gave no heed to the repeated admonitions of the prophet Jeremiah to save himself with his capital and his people from inevitable destruction by surrendering to Nebuchadnezzar (comp. Jer. xxi., xxxvii., and xxxviii.), but pushed matters to extremity, until the famine so prevailed that it gave occasion to inhuman scenes of atrocity (comp. Lam. ii. 20—22, iv. 9, 10) and the walls were broken through by the besiegers. The prevalence of the famine is mentioned not *quod propter eam non aptus fuit amplius populus ad resistendum* (S. Schm. and others), but in token of the truth of the prophetic announcements, Lev. xxvi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 53—57; Jer. xv. 2 f., xxvii. 13; Ezek. iv. 16 f., etc.—V. 4. In the beginning the date of the month is wanting; by an error of transcription the words בַּחֹדֶשׁ הָרְבִיעִי (Jer. lii. 6) have fallen out. וַתִּבָּקַע הָעִיר, that is, the walls were broken through by the enemy, so that they entered the city. From the detailed description of this irruption into the city, Jer. xxxix. 3—5, it appears that the Chaldeans burst through the walls of the lower city, the second wall built by Hezekiah and Manasseh (2 Chr. xxxii. 5, and xxxiii. 14) and occupied the lower city (הַמִּשְׁנֶה xxii. 14); for the Chaldean commanders after this irruption posted themselves at the middle gate, which at all events was in the wall separating the upper city, or Zion, from the lower city, and formed the

entrance from the latter to the former (comp. Rosenm. bibl. Althk. ii. 2, p. 222.) When Zedekiah saw them here he made his escape with his troops by night on the way through the gate between the two walls by the king's garden, and fled to the plain, but was pursued by the Chaldeans and overtaken in the plains of Jericho, while his whole army was scattered from him (vv. 4, 5), exactly as Ezekiel (xii. 12 ff.) had foreseen in the spirit. Probably the region about the gate through which Zedekiah fled, was less carefully watched by the Chaldeans, so that he got off, and was only overtaken and captured by the pursuing Chaldeans some miles from Jerusalem. The distance from Jerusalem to Araba is reckoned at five hours (Rob. ii. p. 536.) In our text the verb is wanting in the sentence וְכָל־אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה וגו׳, and the various attempts of the old expositors to explain it by grammatical ellipses prove to be so forced that we must here also suppose something dropped out of the text. In Jer. lii. 7 and xxxix. 4 stand the words יִבְרְחוּ וַיֵּצְאוּ מֵהָעִיר of which the one verb at least must have originally stood here. דֶּרֶךְ שַׁעַר the way which led through the gate. The situation of "the gate between the two walls" is more exactly defined by אֲשֶׁר עַל־גַּן הַמֶּלֶךְ. The king's garden lay, according to Neh. iii. 15, at the pool of Siloam, that is, at the mouth of the Tyropœon; comp. Rob. ii. p. 142 ff. Consequently a double wall must here have barred the entrance into the glen between the southeast corner of Zion and the southern point of Ophel,[1]

[1] A trace of the outermost of these two walls appears to be still extant in the "rude pathway which crosses the mouth of the Tyropœon, on a mound hard by the old mulberry tree which marks the traditional spot of Isaiah's martyrdom" (Rob. ii. p. 147, and i. p. 384), but the inner wall perhaps went over from Zion to Ophel, directly below the pool of Siloam. Between these two walls there was in Hezekiah's time a reservoir, מִקְוָה (Is. xxii. 11), for the water of the old pool, that is, the so-called pool of Siloam, the position of which in all probability is still to be found in the basin above the afore-mentioned mound, which is now cultivated as a garden, and where formerly, according to the accounts of the old travellers, was a large collection of water (Rob. ii. p. 147.) This O. Thenius has shown with a high degree of evidence in his learned treatise on the tombs of the kings of Judah, with a plan of Jerusalem, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol,

through the gate of which Zedekiah escaped. To וַיֵּלֶךְ the subject הַמֶּלֶךְ is wanting, which appears from the connection. דֶּרֶךְ הָעֲרָבָה the way toward the plain. הָעֲרָבָה denotes in the Old Testament the great plain or valley which extended from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, and thence to the head of the Elanitic Gulf, and in the region of the Dead Sea near Jericho expanded to the great breadth of eleven or twelve miles (Rob. ii. p. 451, comp. p. 536), so that here the part of it situated west of the Jordan bore the name of Arboth of Jericho (Jos. iv. 13, v. 10 etc.), the eastern part that of Arboth of Moab (Num. xxii. 1; Deut. xxxiv. 1, 8.) At present the old name العربة remains only in the southern half of this depression from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf; the northern part, through which the Jordan flows, from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea is called الغور *el Ghor;* comp. Ges. *thes.* ii. 1066, Hengstenb. d. Gesh. Bil. p. 227 ff., and Rob. Pal. iii. p. 153 ff. ii. p. 498 ff., 535 ff., etc.—V. 6. Zedekiah, seized by the Chaldeans, is brought to the king of Babylon at Riblah and there judged. According to v. 1 Nebuchadnezzar had personally opened the siege of Jerusalem; subsequently, however, perhaps after having repelled the Egyptians marching to the relief of the besieged city, he committed to his generals the prosecution of the long protracted siege, and retired himself to Riblah in the land of Hamath (comp. on xxiii. 33), from which he directed the whole operations of the war. דִּבֶּר מִשְׁפָּט אֶת־פל׳ is properly to engage in a lawsuit with any one, then, to hear and judge any one. The prophet Jeremiah always uses the plural מִשְׁפָּטִים in this phrase, comp. i. 16, iv. 12, xxxix. 5, and lii. 9.—Instead of the plural וַיְדַבְּרוּ stands in Jer. xxxix. 5, and lii. 9, the sing. וַיְדַבֵּר "he (the king of Babylon) gave judgment upon him;" so also in the following verse the sing. וַיִּשְׁחַט for שָׁחֲטוּ.—V. 7. The judgment passed and immediately executed upon Zedekiah was the righteous recompense for his breach of oath and disregard of the

1844, part i. p. 19 ff., which unfortunately only came under my eye when the greater part of this work was printed, so that I could not sooner refer to it.

decree of the Lord announced to him by Jeremiah during the siege, that he, by a voluntary surrender to the Chaldeans, would save not only his life but also Jerusalem from destruction, but by the contrary course would prepare the most ignominious ruin for himself, his own, the city, and the whole people; comp. Jer. xxxviii. 17 ff., xxxii. 5, xxxiv. 3 ff.—His sons, who, although not mentioned in the foregoing narrative, had yet fled with him and been seized, likewise, according to Jer. xxxix. 6, and lii. 10, all the nobles and princes of Judah were slain before his eyes; thereupon he himself was blinded, bound with two chains of brass, and carried to Babylon, where, according to Jer. lii. 11, he remained in prison till the day of his death, so that he came to Babylon, as Ezekiel xii. 13 had predicted, but did not see the land, and there died. Blinding seems to have been a usual punishment with the Babylonians as with the Persians (comp. Herod. vii. 18, and Brisson. *de regio Pers. princ.* p. 589), where it is still inflicted on the princes who are declared to have forfeited the right to the throne, comp. Chardin in Rosenm. A. u. N. Morgenl. iii. p. 250 ff.—Samson also was blinded by the Philistines, Judg. xxi. 16.

Vv. 8—21. Comp. Jer. xxxix. 8—10, and lii. 12—27. Burning of the temple and the city, and razing of its walls, vv. 8—10; removal of the people except the lowest populace, vv. 11 and 12; destruction of the great brazen vessels of the temple, and removal of the broken metal, together with the remaining gold and silver vessels, vv. 13—17; execution of more captives at Riblah, vv. 18—21.—V. 8. Instead of "on the seventh day" stands in Jer. lii. 12 "on the tenth day of the month." This difference may at all events be explained with the old interpreters by the burning of the city lasting several days, so that the seventh or the tenth day might be named, according as the beginning or end was stated. All other attempts at reconciliation are unnatural. But as some other differences of this kind, as v. 17 three cubits for five cubits (Jer. lii. 22), and five men (v. 19) for seven men (Jer. lii. 25), occur, we can scarcely explain them otherwise than as having originated from the exchange of the letters of the old alphabet used as numerals, whereby, however, in the first and second case it must remain undecided, which text contains the error.—The nineteenth year

of Nebuchadnezzar is the eleventh of Zedekiah, comp. on xxiv. 8.—Nebuzaradan נְבוּזַרְאֲדָן, according to the explanation of Gesenius, *Mercurii dux dominus, i.e., cui Mercurius favet (thes.* ii. 839.) רַב־טַבָּחִים properly *praefectus carnificum*, the captain of the body-guard among the Babylonians and Egyptians (Gen. xxxvii. 36, 39, etc.), on whom, as on the Cherethites and Pelethites under the Israelitish kings, the execution of the sentence on criminals devolved, see above p. 30.—Nebuzaradan had not taken part in the conquest of Jerusalem (comp. Jer. xxxix. 3), but was ordered to Jerusalem after the punishment of Zedekiah to effect the destruction of the city, the removal of the remaining people, and the appointment of a governor over those who remained in the land. Instead of מֶלֶךְ stands in Jer. v. 12 עָמַד לִפְנֵי מֶלֶךְ without אֲשֶׁר, which is not easily omitted in prose. The בְּ before יְרוּשָׁלָם in Jer. is here omitted as easily misunderstood. Hitzig connects it with בָּא, which is scarcely correct.—V. 9. The last words, "and every great house (properly every great man's house) burned he with fire," serve to define more strictly אֶת כָּל־בָּתֵּי; not all houses to the very last, but only great houses were burned down. In v. 10 כָּל is wanting before חוֹמֹת as not necessary for the sense, and אֶת before רב טב׳ (Jer. lii. 14), which can only be omitted by an error of the pen, as אֲשֶׁר רַב־טב׳ without אֶת, with, affords no sense.—V. 11. הַנֹּפְלִים וגו׳, "the deserters who went over to the king of Babylon." Under the אֵת יֶתֶר הֶהָמוֹן the (still) remaining multitude are included the two before-mentioned classes of the people that were left. In Jer. lii. 15 stand הָאָמוֹן instead of הֶהָמוֹן, which Hitzig explains foreman of works according to Prov. viii. 30, and understands thereby the two classes הֶחָרָשׁ and הַמַּסְגֵּר (xxiv. 14—16). Very improbable. For even if the besieged city needed these operatives, and certainly had them, yet still they are not here specially mentioned, as we perceive from Jer. xxxiv. 9. אָמוֹן is perhaps only another form for הָמוֹן, comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 116. The import of this verse is moreover limited by v. 12, according to which Nebuzaradan did not carry away the people to the last man, but left of the lowest of the people to be vine dressers and

husbandmen. דַּלַּת הָאָרֶץ = דַּלַּת עַם הָאָרֶץ comp. xxiv. 14. The form דַּלּוֹת, Jer. lii. 16 is a plural with an abstract signification. For גָּבִים from גּוּב *secuit, spec. aravit,* the *Keri* has יֹגְבִים for יָגַב according to Jer. lii. 16 with the same meaning.—Vv. 13—17. Concerning the brazen pillars in the temple broken up by the Chaldeans, the brazen bases for the lavers and the brazen sea, compare on 1 Ki. vii. 15 ff. above p. 101 ff. The description is briefer in our text than in Jer. lii. 17—23. In v. 14 are omitted the greater and smaller brazen dishes מִזְרָקוֹת and כַּפּוֹת requisite for the service at the altar of burnt-offering, comp. Jer. lii. 18. In v. 15 of the gold and silver vessels, only מַחְתּוֹת firepans and מִזְרָקוֹת watering pots or dishes are mentioned, in Jer. lii. 19, besides these, five other names of similar vessels. In v. 16 supplementary reference is made to the unweighed abundance of the brass of those great vessels, and in v. 17 to the elaborate workmanship of the pillars. In Jer. the brazen oxen under the brazen sea are also mentioned in v. 20—23, and in the description of the brazen pillars several points are brought out, which in our narrative are wanting not merely here but also above in 1 Ki. vii. 15—22. See the particulars vol. i. p. 123—125.—On vv. 18—21 comp. Jer. lii. 24—27. The persons here mentioned, who were seized at the burning of the temple and the city, brought before Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah and there executed, are different from the princes and nobles of Judah, who were taken captive with Zedekiah in his flight, and slain before his eyes at Riblah (Jer. lii. 10 and xxxix. 6.) They are identified by Hitzig without the slightest ground. Seraiah, the high priest, was the grandfather or great-grandfather, not, as most of the ancients supposed, the father of Ezra the scribe (Ezr. vii. 1; 1 Chr. v. 40;) his son Jehozadak was carried away to Babylon (1 Chr. v. 41.) Zephaniah, a priest of the second order (כֹּהֵן מִשְׁנֶה, comp. on xxiii. 4), is probably the same as the son of Maaseiah, who, according to Jer. xxi. 2, xxix. 25 and 29, xxxvii. 3, held an important place among the priests. But whether the three keepers of the threshold, that is, doorkeeping Levites, seized along with these priests, "stood next to them in rank," as Hitzig conjectures, must be left undecided.—V. 19.

For אֲשֶׁר הוּא פָקִיד, "who was overseer," stands in Jer. lii. 25 אֲשֶׁר הָיָה פָקִיד, "who had been overseer." In favour of this reading Hitzig rejects the הוּא of our text, but wrongly; for this officer (סָרִיס) was not yet deprived of his office; he held it still, when he was seized by the Chaldeans.—"Five men of those who saw the face of the king" belonged to his immediate retinue, *de intimis consiliariis regis*. This designation is explained by the custom of eastern rulers to withdraw themselves as much as possible from the view of their subjects, comp. Paulsen, d. Reg. d. Morgenl. i. p. 482 ff. According to Jer. lii. 25 there were *seven;* comp. on v. 8. הַסֹּפֵר appears here to be equivalent to שַׂר הַצָּבָא. Against this, indeed, Hitzig has objected, "the general is no scribe," and therefore giving the preference to the reading of Jer. סֹפֵר without the article renders: "and the scribe of the commander;" but the correctness of this observation and rendering is liable to considerable doubt. For as the restrictive phrase הַמַּצְבִּא אֶת־עַם הָאָרֶץ can be referred only to סֹפֵר, not to שַׂר הַצָּבָא, which needs no such restriction, so סֹפֵר here at all events denotes a military officer (comp. above p. 43 note), in which case it is not easy to perceive, why this סֹפֵר who summons the people to war and drills them to arms, might not be a commander and be so designated. הִצְבִּא *procedere jussit in bellum* denotes probably not merely the levying of troops, but at the same time the drilling of those levied in the use of arms. The sixty men of the עַם הָאָרֶץ belonged either to the instigators of the rebellion or had by some other means incurred the resentment of the Chaldeans, so that they were executed and not carried into exile like the rest of the people.—V. 21. With the words וַיִּגֶל וגו׳, "so Judah was carried away out of the land," the narrative of the destruction of the kingdom of Judah is closed, comp. xvii. 23. The immediately following verses 22—26, give an account of the people who were left in the land.

Vv. 22—26. Over the people left in the land Nebuchadnezzar appointed Gedaliah as governor, who fixed his residence at Mizpah. After the Chaldeans had departed, the fugitives assembled around him, and among them the officers of war, who had escaped by flight from the hands of the Chaldeans, and re-

ceived from him the assurance on oath of protection and security from the Chaldeans, if they would only conduct themselves peaceably and cultivate the land. But Gedaliah was soon slain at the instigation of the princes of the Ammonites (Jer. xl. 14), by Ishmael, one of the officers, a scion of the royal blood, in consequence of which deed the others with the people fled into Egypt from fear of the vengeance of the Chaldeans. Concerning these events, related here only in a scanty abstract, we receive much more particular accounts from Jer. xi.—xliv., where the procedure of this prophet among the people still left in the land is described.—V. 22. Gedaliah was the son of Ahikam, who had formerly saved the life of Jeremiah (Jer. xxvi. 24), and the grandson of Shaphan, a man not otherwise known, comp. on xxii. 12. Lyra and some Rabbins take Gedaliah to be a deserter, *qui in suprema urbis obsidione dediderat se Chaldaeis, monita Jeremiae suadentis hortantisque regem et populum, ut dedentes se mala extrema evitarent, secutus*, (comp. Calmet on our verse). A not improbable conjecture, but still we cannot receive it as a historical fact. Gedaliah had received from Nebuchadnezzar the superintendence of all that were left in the land, men, women, children, poor, also some daughters of the king, and courtiers, whom it had not been thought necessary or worth while to remove, comp. Jer. xl. 7, xli. 10 and 16. Nebuzaradan had also assigned to him the prophet Jeremiah, who was undetermined to make use of the freedom given him to go to Babylon or remain in the land, Jer. xl. 2—6, comp. with xxxix. 14.—V. 23. Concerning Mizpah in the land of Benjamin, see above p. 235.—Of the fugitives scattered in and beyond the land, (comp. Jer. xl. 7 and 11), who came to Gedaliah, the military officers are particularly mentioned. הָאֲנָשִׁים are the men belonging to the שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים; this appears even from our verse, inasmuch as הֵמָּה וְהָאֲנָשִׁים is repeated at the close of the verse by הֵמָּה וְאַנְשֵׁיהֶם, and still more clearly from Jer. xl. 7 and 8, where the שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים by the addition אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׂדֶה, who lived in the field, that is, in the open air, are designated as those who dwelt in the country. Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, is farther designated, v. 25, as the grandson of Elishama, probably the officer mentioned Jer. xxxvi. 12 and 20, and was of the seed royal. Of

the remaining persons nothing else is known; only of Johanan it is mentioned Jer. xl.—xlii., that he warned Gedaliah of the traitor Ishmael, and, when the former, disregarding his warning, was slain, put himself at the head of the people, and, notwithstanding the dissuasions of Jeremiah, fled with them to Egypt. In Jer. xl. 8, along with Johanan, his brother Jonathan is mentioned, which name has probably fallen out here by a slip of the pen. Before הַנְּטֹפָתִי stands in Jer. xl. 8, וּבְנֵי עֵופַי, according to which not Seraiah, but עופי came from Netophah, whose sons were among the officers of war. Netophah, according to Ezr. ii 22, Neh. vii. 26, was in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem, and is therefore scarcely the same as the present village Beit Netif, south-west of Jerusalem, comp. Rob. ii. p. 600. The name יַאֲזַנְיָהוּ is written Jer. xl. 8, יְזַנְיָהוּ, and xlii. 1, יְזַנְיָה. Jaazaniah was a Syrian naturalized in the kingdom of Judah from the Syrian district and former kingdom of Maachah (מַעֲכָה), on the northern boundary of Palestine, on the western slope of Hermon, Deut. iii. 10, Jos. xii. 4 f., and von Raum. Pal. p. 224. בֶּן־הַמַּעֲכָתִי means the Maachathite. V. 24. Because they had borne arms against the Chaldeans, these fugitives feared their vengeance, as we may conclude from this, that Gedaliah promised them security on oath, and admonished them to remain in the land and be subject to the king of Babylon, and it would be well with them. According to Jer. xl. 9, he promises to intercede for them with the Chaldeans, and invites them to return to their cities and gather wine, fruits, and oil. The עַבְדֵי הַכַּשְׂדִּים are the officers, whom Nebuchadnezzar had left in the land and placed over it. The governor Gedaliah also had Chaldeans with him (v. 25.)—V. 25. Ishmael was sent by Baalis, the king of the Ammonites, and Gedaliah was apprized and warned by Johanan of the intended crime, but had given no credit to the information of Johanan (Jer. xl. 13—16). Ishmael perpetrated the murder, when he, with his ten men invited by Gedaliah to an entertainment, did eat in his house (Jer. xli. 3). The Jews and the Chaldeans with Gedaliah were military men (Jer. xli. 3), whom he as governor had with him for order and protection. Their number cannot have been great, as Ishmael with ten men was able to put them to death. After Ishmael had committed

this crime, and also slain a number of men from Shechem, Shiloh and Samaria, who came with an offering, he carried away captive the people that were in Mizpah, and departed to go over to the Ammonites, but, as soon as his deed was known, was pursued by Johanan and the other captains of the forces, and overtaken at Gibeon, whereupon the people that were carried away by him left him and passed over to Johanan, so that he only with eight men could escape and make his way to the Ammonites (Jer. xli. 4—13). But Johanan, with the other captains and the remaining people, went into the region of Bethlehem, with the view of fleeing into Egypt from fear of the Chaldeans. Here they applied, indeed, to the prophet Jeremiah, in order to learn from him the will of the Lord, but notwithstanding the word of the Lord communicated to them by him, that if they remained in the land they need not be afraid of the king of Babylon, but if they went to Egypt they should all perish by the sword, famine, and pestilence, and notwithstanding the prediction, that the Lord would also give Pharaoh Hophra into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xlii.), they proceeded to Egypt, taking the prophet with them, and settled in the various cities of Egypt, where they gave themselves up to idolatry, and could not be weaned from it even by the severest judgments denounced against them for it by Jeremiah in the name of the Lord (Jer. xliii. and xliv.)

Vv. 27—30. Comp. Jer. lii. 31—34. Jehoiachin is released from prison by Evilmerodach, brought to his court, and treated with honour. The thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin corresponds to the year 562–61 B.C., in which Nebuchadnezzar died, after a reign of forty-three years reckoned from 604. The twelfth month of this year coincides nearly with March 561. In this year his son Evilmerodach became king (בִּשְׁנַת מָלְכוֹ), and probably as soon as he ascended the throne showed favour to king Jehoiachin, after he had languished in prison for more than thirty-six years. Instead of the 27th day the 25th is given in Jer. lii. 31; a difference, again, which has arisen by the exchange of similar letters; comp. on v. 8. Evilmerodach (אֱוִיל מְרֹדַךְ, *Εὐειλμαράδουχος* in Berosus) reigned according to Berosus, in Josephus *c. Ap.* i. 20 and the canon of Ptol., two

years, according to the testimony of Josephus ἀνόμως καὶ ἀσελγῶς, and was murdered by his brother-in-law Neriglissar. According to Josephus (*Ant.* x. 11, 2) he reigned eighteen, and according to Alex. Polyh. (*in Eusebii Chron. arm.* p. 21), twelve years. But both statements are obviously false, and the two years' reign, for which also Niebuhr (kl. histor. Schrift. i. p. 199) has declared himself, is demanded by the chronology of the subsequent Babylonian sovereigns. Comp. Ges. *thes.* i. 41, and Win. R.W. i. p. 419, where also the other very diverse modes of writing the name are collected. נָשָׂא רֹאשׁ פל׳, to lift up the head of any one from prison, that is, to bring him out of it, comp. Gen. lx. 13.—V. 28. וַיְדַבֵּר אִתּוֹ טֹבוֹת, "he spake with him kindly," comp. Jer. xii. 6. "And set his seat above the seat of the kings that were with him in Babylon." This phrase is not with Hitzig to be taken literally, as if he gave him a higher seat, but figuratively, *loco honestiore eum habuit* (Rosenm.); he gave him precedence of the other kings. These kings were also probably those, who having, like Jehoiachin, been deprived of their lands by Nebuchadnezzar, lived at the Babylonian court for the augmentation of its splendour (Hitzig). Thus, for example, Cyrus kept the conquered Crœsus with him (Herod. i. 88.)—V. 29. "And he (Jehoiachin) changed his prison garments," that is, laid them aside and put on others. Joseph did the same, when he was brought from prison to appear before Pharoah (Gen. xli. 42). The subject to שִׁנָּא is obviously Jehoiachin as in the following sentence, no longer Evilmerodach, as Dereser, Hitzig, and others suppose.—"He ate continually before him," that is, he lived at the royal table, comp. p. 25.—V. 30. Moreover, Jehoiachin received, as probably also the other kihgs, a daily allowance of food or provisions for the sustenance of the servants, who composed his small court. אֲרֻחָה (from ארח *definivit) cibi commeatusque portio alicui definita* (Gesen.). The words כָּל־יְמֵי חַיָּיו many interpreters, for instance, Calmet, understand of the life of Evilmerodach; but Seb. Schm., with the older Rabbins, rightly declare in favour of its reference to the days of Jehoiachin *ex scopo hujus loci, qui est ut doceatur, quid deinceps Jojachino contigerit: quae narratio imperfecta esset, nisi tota ejus vita comprehenderetur.* Moreover, it cannot be inferred with certainty

from this statement, that Jehoiachin died before Evilmerodach (Havern. Einl. ii. 1. p. 170); for the favour shown to Jehoiachin by Evilmerodach might also be continued by his successors. Concerning the cause of this special kindness of Evilmerodach to Jehoiachin, Hitzig on Jer. has proposed various conjectures, all of which, however, have only slight probability. The higher ground of this favourable change in the captivity of Jehoiachin lies in the Divine purpose of grace, that the seed of David should be severely corrected indeed for their apostasy from the Lord, but not utterly cast off (2 Sam. vii. 14 and 15). It was at the same time for the whole captive people a prognostic of the future turning of their captivity, when they, recognising their exile as a merited punishment for their sins, should turn to the Lord their God with all their heart.

THE

# BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES:

BY

ERNST BERTHEAU,

PROFESSOR IN GOETTINGEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

JAMES MARTIN, B.A.

EDINBURGH.

# PREFACE.

It was originally the intention of the publishers to issue *Keil's* work on the Chronicles in connection with his Commentary on the Books of Kings. But on further consideration they have thought it unadvisable to do so. The character of that work, as stated in the title *(apologetischer Versuch)*, is purely apologetical. It was written as an answer to objections made by *De Wette* and *Dahler* to the credibility of the two Books of the Chronicles, objections which scarcely any one would think of repeating now. It is undoubtedly a book of great worth, not only meeting the attacks referred to in a thorough and successful manner, but containing a large amount of important matter which needs only to be thrown into a different shape to form the groundwork of a valuable exposition of these historical books. At the same time the prominence given to the (now exploded) objections offered by the writers named, and the space occupied by the answers to those objections, so greatly detract from the present worth of the book, especially to English readers, that the publishers have thought it right to give up the original design.

In the place of the work of *Keil* they have selected for publication the latest commentary that has appeared in Germany on the Books of Chronicles. As their object, however, has been rather to give completeness to the Commentary on Kings than to issue an independent exposition of the Chronicles, they have decided to omit certain portions of Bertheau's work, especially his notes on such passages as are found in precisely the same form in the Books of Kings. In other words this supplement contains an exposition of all the matter contained in the Chronicles, which has not already been expounded by *Keil* in this and the preceding volume, with the exception of the lengthy genealogical

tables, which occupy the first nine chapters of the first Book. The reader will also find between brackets occasional extracts from *Keil's* work on the Chronicles, which it has been thought desirable to introduce on account of their containing a fuller or more satisfactory elucidation of the text, than is to be found in the original work.

THE

# BOOKS OF THE CHRONICLES.

---

## PART I.

### GENEALOGICAL TABLES.

I. Chaps. i.—iii. *The Pedigree of David.* (1.) Chap. i. 1—23. The ten members from Adam to Noah; Noah's three sons, and the seventy nations that were descended from them. (2.) Vv. 24—42. The ten members from Shem to Abraham; his sons, and the seventy tribes that sprang either directly from Abraham or from the rest of the members named. Vv. 43—54. List of the kings and princes in Edom. (3.) Chap. ii. The twelve tribes of Israel, and the seventy descendants of Judah (vv. 1—41); an appendix to this list (vv. 42—55.) (4.) Chap. iii. The descendants of David.

II. Chap. iv.—vii.—*The twelve tribes of Israel.* (1.) Chap. iv. 1—23. The tribe of Judah. (2.) Vv. 24—43. The tribe of Simeon. (3.) Chap. v. 1—10. The tribe of Reuben. (4.) Vv. 11—22. The tribe of Gad. (5.) Vv. 23—26. The half of Manasseh. (6.) V. 27—vi. 66. The tribe of Levi. (7.) Chap. vii. 1—5. The tribe of Issachar. (8.) Vv. 6—11. The tribe of Benjamin. (9.) V. 12. The tribe of Dan. (10.) V. 13. The tribe of Naphtali. (11.) Vv. 14—19. The half tribe of Manasseh. (12.) Vv. 20—29. The tribe of Ephraim. (13.) Vv. 30—40. The tribe of Asher.

III. Chap. viii.—ix. 34. *The inhabitants of Jerusalem.* (1.) Chap. viii. The tribe of Benjamin. (2.) Chap. ix. 1—34. *The heads of the people* dwelling in Jerusalem.

# PART II.

## 1 Chr. ix. 35 to 2 Chr. xxxvi.

### HISTORY OF THE KINGS IN JERUSALEM FROM DAVID TO ZEDEKIAH THE LAST IN THE SERIES OF KINGS BELONGING TO THE HOUSE OF DAVID.

## I. Chap. ix. 35—Chap. xxix.

### HISTORY OF DAVID.

A few brief notices of the family of Saul, and the fate of his house, serve as an introduction to the history of David's reign in Jerusalem (chap. ix. 35—x. 14). The anointing of David in Hebron by the elders of the people is then dismissed in a very few words (chap. xi. 1—3). And without touching upon the relation in which he stood to Abner and to Saul's son Ishbosheth, or saying anything with reference to the period during which he reigned in Hebron, the historian hastens to describe the conquest of Jerusalem, which forms the starting-point for an elaborate account of the history of the kingdom in that city (chap. xi. 4—9). Having given a list of David's heroes (chap. xi. 10—47), he appends another list of those who attached themselves to him during the life time of Saul (chap. xii. 1—22), and then returns to chap. xi. 1—3, for the purpose of giving a more detailed description of the popular assembly which was held in Hebron, when David was chosen king (chap. xii. 23—40.) His principal object is to speak of the sacred institutions of which David was the founder, and to commemorate his care for the sanctuary of Israel; he therefore begins at once by relating how David brought up the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem (chap. xiii.). For a short time, however, he interrupts his narrative, and introduces a series of brief notices of the building of David's house, his

family, and a war with the Philistines (chap. xiv.). The thread is then resumed in chap. xv. and xvi. In the same manner does he break off his account of the intended erection of a temple (chap. xvii.), and after describing certain of David's wars and other events, resumes the subject at chap. xxi. 28, and brings it to a conclusion in chap. xxii. The historian is now able to proceed more quietly, and dwells at greater length upon the arrangements which were made by David for the worship of God (chap. xxiii.—xxvi.). A description of his army and a list of his officers are now introduced (chap. xxvii.), and these are followed by his final instructions and an account of his death (chap. xxviii. and xxix.).

## 1. Chap. ix. 35—Chap. x.

### FAMILY OF SAUL AND FATE OF HIS HOUSE.

Chap. ix. vv. 35—44. *Saul's family*. This list has already been given in the account of the different families of the Benjaminites at chap. viii. 29—39, the only difference being that in the present instance it terminates with the sons of Azel, and therefore contains two verses less than the former list. *Herzfeld* quotes a statement of the *Mar Sutra* to the effect that 400 camel-loads, or, according to another passage, 1300 camel-loads of explanations had been written on this repetition and the ninth chapter in general. The reason for the repetition is simply this, that here the list forms an introduction to the account of Saul's death, whereas it is given in chap. viii. in order that the celebrated family of Saul may not be omitted from the list of the Benjaminites. Hence the list given in the verses before us serves to connect the history of the kingdom with the genealogical lists, which precede it. This might no doubt have been done by a simple reference to the list already given, or by repeating the first part alone. The historian apparently felt this, and therefore stopped at the first favourable opportunity, viz., when he reached the words, "these are the sons of Azel." He could not well stop before, as the list of the descendants of Ner is continued to this point in uninterrupted succession. The fondness of the his-

torian for genealogical lists may undoubtedly also be seen in this repetition; for, were it not for this predilection, he would probably have adopted some other means of connecting the narrative with the preceding genealogies.

Chap. x. 1—14. *Death of Saul. David obtains possession of the government.* The first twelve verses occur, with very slight variations, in precisely the same form in 1 Sam. xxxi. 1—13. The concluding remark in vv. 13, 14, is added by our historian, and shows that the account of Saul's death is intended as an introduction to the history of David. Vv. 1—12. These verses merely contain the concluding part of an account of the last battle between the Philistines and the Israelites under Saul, which is to be found at much greater length in the books of Samuel. According to 1 Sam. xxviii. 4 the Philistines, accompanied by David and his men, were encamped at Shunem, Saul and the Israelites on the mountains of Gilboa. They left their positions, however, and fought a pitched battle in the plain of Jezreel (chap. xxix. 1.) David took no part in the battle. The Israelites were defeated, and fled back to their former quarters, but were pursued by the Philistines. This accounts for the fact that (V. 1) *wounded* Israelites *fell in the mountains of Gilboa.*—V. 2. The Philistines *followed hard after* Saul. The verb literally denotes continuous and hot pursuit.—V. 3. Instead of *the shooters with bows,* we read in 1 Sam. xxxi. the shooters, men with bows. The word men probably appeared superfluous on account of the shooters being described as *archers* (shooters with bows), and was therefore omitted. Hence the reading in Samuel is to be regarded as the original text.—*Then the archers* of the Philistines *hit* Saul, *then he trembled before the archers.* When the archers, who evidently fought as light troops in the front ranks, came near to Saul, he trembled, as he had already done when he saw the camp of the Philistines (1 Sam. xxviii. 5), from a presentimen of his approaching defeat. The thought of imprisonment and of the insults to which he would be exposed overcame the hero. There is nothing in the words, which he addressed to his armour-bearer (v. 4), to lead us to conclude that in his last moments he was free from the agitation which his trembling had indicated. Hence the state of mind, in which we find Saul a short time before his death, does not furnish the least ground, as some have

supposed that it does, for questioning the correctness of the Masoretic explanation of the word וַיָּחֶל. This reading is confirmed by the preposition מִן and the adverb "exceedingly," which is added in 1 Sam. xxxi. It is true the word only occurs here and in the corresponding passage in Samuel, but in Ps. xcvii. 4 we find וַתָּחֵל, and the other persons of the Imperfect יָחִיל are by no means rarely met with. The translators of the Septuagint appear to have hesitated to adopt the rendering "he trembled." In the passage before us they have substituted *καὶ ἐπόνεσαν* (*Alex. ἐπόνεσεν*) *ἀπὸ τῶν τόξων;* but in 1 Sam. xxxi. they render the words in a very different manner, viz., *ἐτραυματίσθη εἰς τὰ ὑποχόνδρια.* From this *Thenius* conjectures that the reading in the original text must have been וַיֵּחַל אֶל הַמְּרֹרִים, *he was wounded near the gall.* But the present reading in the Chronicles favours such a conjecture even less than the text of the Book of Samuel.—V. 4. After "*these uncircumcised*" we find the words "thrust me through," in the Book of Samuel. It is very possible that they may have fallen out of our text in consequence of the same words occurring immediately before; at the same time it is equally possible that their introduction into the text of Samuel may be explained in the same way. As the request to the armour-bearer, "*draw thy sword and thrust me through,*" can only have proceeded from a desire that the Philistines might not *abuse* the living Saul, and as they would have quite as much power to abuse his corpse, after he had been slain by his armour-bearer, the reason assigned for the request, "thrust me through," can hardly have been "in order that they may not thrust me through." Saul was not afraid of being slain by the Philistines, as Abimelech had formerly feared to meet death at the hands of a woman (Judg. ix. 54), but what he feared was that he might fall into the hands of the Philistines alive. Hence we conclude that the words did not originally form part of the text. The supposition, that in the Book of Samuel they have crept in through an oversight, is confirmed by the fact, that the word is written the second time in precisely the same form as the first, although in the first instance it occurs as an Imperative.—V. 5. The armour-bearer kills himself, because he wishes not to outlive his king and captain, or to fall into the hands of the Philistines alive. We need not search for any other motive.—V. 6. And all his

*house died together;* in 1 Sam. xxxi. we read *and his armour bearer and all his men died that same day together.* And instead of the following passage (v. 7), *when the men of Israel saw that they fled,* we find in Samuel, "when the men of Israel . . . saw that the men of Israel fled." From this we conclude that the author of the Chronicles intentionally avoided speaking of the men of Saul or of Israel, who had taken part in the fight, because it was not his purpose to give a full description of the course of the battle. His design was merely to relate the death of Saul and his sons, that he might show how David obtained possession of the throne. As he wished to show the consequences of the battle with reference to the house of Saul in as few words as possible, he could very properly make use of the expression *and all his house died together,* although it was not strictly correct; for there was no necessity to mention Ishbosheth the son of Saul, who still remained alive, as the plan of his work did not require him to refer to the connection which existed between David and Ishbosheth, nor had he any occasion to say more about the perpetuation of the family of Saul in the descendants named in chap. ix. 35—44. All that his plan required was, that he should show how the government passed from Saul to David. The immediate cause of this was the death of Saul and of such of his sons as the nation might possibly have thought of, when they met to choose a new king.—V. 7. The bodies of Saul and his sons fell into the hands of the Philistines, for the Israelites, who dwelt in the neighbourhood of Gilboa, had deserted their cities on the flight of Saul and his sons, and were, therefore, not in a position to rescue their bodies from the enemy. The Israelites in the neighbourhood of Gilboa are here described as the men of Israel that were in the plain, *i.e.*, the plain of Jezreel. In Samuel they are called with greater precision "the men of Israel who were *by the side of the plain* and *by the side of* the Jordan," *i.e.*, those who dwelt to the west and east of Gilboa. The difference is very trifling, and there is no necessity for supposing that our historian had a faulty text before him (*Thenius* on Samuel), since there are other passages in which similar slight alterations occur.—V. 8. The following day the Philistines, on examining the dead, found the bodies of Saul and his sons. The rest of the day, on which the battle was fought, had probably been

occupied in the capture of the deserted cities. When the exertions of the conflict were over the next thing wanted was rest, and there was no necessity to search the bodies till the second day.—V. 9. *They stripped him and took his head and his armour.* (1 Sam. they cut off his head, and stripped off his armour). And *they sent away, sc.,* the head and the armour of Saul. According to a very common custom, the objects just named are not repeated. In the Septuagint translation of 1 Sam. we find *καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτά,* but it does not follow that the text must have had the third person plural suffix attached to the verb. In the passage before us they have merely *καὶ ἀπέστειλαν.* The head and armour of Saul were sent throughout the land of the Philistines, as a welcome confirmation of the good news of victory (cf. Judges xix. 29 seq.), to announce the glad tidings to *the idols* and to the people. In 1 Sam we read *in the house of their idols,* but the word *house* has been omitted by the Septuagint. The reading in the Chronicles is the more correct of the two.—V. 10. The armour of Saul was subsequently deposited *in a temple of the Philistines;* cf. 1 Sam. xxi. 9, according to which David had given the sword of Goliath to the high priest to be preserved in the tabernacle. The temple is described in Samuel as the temple of Astarte, and this harmonises very well with the words which follow in the passage before us: *they fixed his skull in the temple of Dagon.* These words are not found in Samuel, and it might be thought that the clause, "they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan," had been substituted for them. But notwithstanding the similarity between the two clauses, we do not agree with *Thenius* that the one is a faulty copy of the other. It is more reasonable to suppose that they stood side by side in the original text, since the text of the book of Samuel furnishes no information as to what the Philistines did with the head; and though the account in the Chronicles appears complete without the clause respecting the fastening of the body of Saul to the wall of Bethshan, yet it would serve to throw light upon the rest of the narrative if it had been there. The occurrence of the word תָּקְעוּ in both clauses, and the fact that in each case it ends with ן, may account for the omission of one of the two. But such an oversight would only account for the absence of the words "*they fastened*

*his head in the temple of Dagon*" from the book of Samuel. It would be trifling and arbitrary to suppose that the other clause was omitted from our passage through a similar oversight; in fact such a supposition would be altogether inadmissible, for in 1 Sam. xxxi. 12 further reference is made to the statement in v. 10, that *they fastened his body to the wall of Bethshan*, but there is no such reference in the Chronicles. From this we conclude that the historian abridged the narrative, and intentionally omitted to state that the corpse was fixed to the wall of Bethshan and fetched away by the men of Jabesh-Gilead; just as in other respects he has made a freer use of his original sources in vv. 10—12.—V. 12. Most of the deviations from 1 Sam. xxxi. are to be traced to the fact that our historian saw no special reason for relating that the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead took the body of Saul from the wall at Bethshan. He omits the fact that they *went all night*, because he was not concerned with the distance they had to travel. גּוּפַת, for גְּוִיַּת in 1 Sam. xxxi., appears to be a word belonging to a later period of the language; at least it is by no means rare in Aramæan, whilst this is the only place in the Old Testament in which it occurs. There is something striking in the omission of the clause, they *burnt them there*. As the burning of a corpse was not a customary thing, and is expressly mentioned in Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9 as an ignominious punishment for great crimes, it certainly presents some difficulty, especially as it is not easy to bring the burning of the bodies into harmony with the statement that they were buried under a tree at Jabesh, and that David afterwards fetched away the bones of Saul and Jonathan from that spot, and buried them in the family sepulchre of Kish (2 Sam. xxi. 12 sqq.) There can be little doubt that our historian intentionally omitted the words relating to the burning. In fact his design in describing the whole transaction did not require him to mention it, and there was therefore no inducement to enter upon an explanation of this particular circumstance for the purpose of guarding against the offence, which they might otherwise have caused. If it could be shown that the burning referred to in 1 Sam. xxxi. 12 is to be understood in the same sense as that described in 2 Chr. xvi. 14, "they made a very great burning for him;" xxi. 19, "his people made no burning for him, like the burning of his fathers;" and

Jer. xxxiv. 5, "with the burnings of thy fathers . . so shall they burn for thee," there would be nothing to astonish us in the absence of any notice of the occurrence here. For in that case the passage merely contains a more precise description of the *honour* shown to Saul at his burial. It must, however, be borne in mind that in the three passages just referred to, the verb is construed with the dative of the person, whereas in 1 Sam. it is followed by an accusative. The inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead, a city on the left bank of the Jordan opposite to Bethshan, showed, in their anxiety that Saul and his sons should have an honourable burial, their attachment to the house of Saul, to whom they were indebted for deliverance from great dangers (1 Sam. xi.)

Vv. 13, 14. The *transgression which he committed against the Lord* was according to these verses a double one: (1) he transgressed *against the word of Jehovah which he did not regard* (this refers especially to the command of Jehovah to lay Amalek under the ban (1 Sam. xv. 11 compared with chap. xxviii. 18; compare also 1 Sam. xiii. 13 with chap. x. 8); (2) he transgressed in *asking counsel* inasmuch as he made use of *necromancy, that he might obtain an oracular response*, cf. 1 Sam. xxviii. The Septuagint has most unnecessarily interpolated the clause *καὶ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ Σαμουὴλ ὁ προφήτης*, vid. Wisdom xlvi. 20.—V. 14. The meaning is: because he did not consult Jehovah, He left him to die. Saul did consult Jehovah, but received no answer (1 Sam. xiv. 37 compared with xxviii. 6), because Jehovah had departed from him (1 Sam. xxviii. 15); and instead of seeking with all earnestness to obtain the favour of Jehovah and then consulting him again, he applied to the necromancer in Endor. And *turned the kingdom;* vid. chap. xii. 23.

## 2. Chap. xi. 1—9.

### DAVID IS ANOINTED KING IN HEBRON, AND CONQUERS JERUSALEM.

Vv. 1—3. (Compare 2 Sam v. 1—3.) After the death of Saul the country on the east of the Jordan, and in a short time

that on the west also, with the exception of the province of Judah, over which David ruled in Hebron, was brought by the skilful generalship of Abner to acknowledge Ishbosheth as king, 2 Sam. ii. 8 seq. It was not till Abner and Ishbosheth were dead, and when there was no one left belonging to the house of Saul but the lame Meribosheth, who was then but twelve years old, that all the Israelites resolved to make David king. These verses contain an account of the assembly in which this resolution was carried into effect.—V. 1. *Then all the Israelites assembled together*, or as it reads in 2 Sam. v., then all the tribes of Israel came *to David unto Hebron*, in order that in a regular assembly of the fighting men of the community, of which we have a full description in chap. xii. 23—40, such a resolution might be adopted as would be binding upon the whole people. *Behold we are thy bone and thy flesh* (Gen. xxix. 14), thou art our countryman, thou belongest like us to the community of Israel, and thou art known to the whole community as their successful general in the wars they have waged with foreign foes, for (v. 2) *a long time ago, even when Saul was king, thou didst lead Israel to war and conduct them back again* (cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 13, 16); *and then Jehovah thy God said to thee*, by Samuel the prophet, &c. (vv. 3, 10; 2 Sam. iii. 9, 18; cf. 1 Sam. xvi. 1—3.) The points of difference between the verse before us and 2 Sam. v. 2 are very trifling.—V. 3. *The elders of Israel* were the representatives of the whole community, who *made a covenant* with David in a solemn manner *(before Jehovah); i.e.*, they made provision for the maintenance of the rights and obligations of the king on the one hand, and those of the people on the other (cf. 1 Sam. x. 25.) Whether the words, "*according to the word of Jehovah by Samuel*," which do not occur in 2 Sam. v. 3, are to be regarded as an explanatory clause appended by the author of the Chronicles, or whether they have fallen out of the text of Samuel through an oversight caused by the similarity in the terminations of the two words Israel and Samuel, as *Thenius* supposes, may not be easy to determine. But on comparing v. 10 in the chapter before us *(according to the word of Jehovah)* with 2 Sam. xxiii. 8, we are led to think the former opinion the more probable of the two. The two verses relating to the length of time, which was spent by David in Hebron and

Jerusalem, are omitted here. The historian hastens to describe the conquest of Jerusalem, and therefore passes quickly over the sojourn in Hebron. And as he introduces the chronological data in a fitting place (chap. xxix. 27), we should be led to conclude that he purposely omitted them here, were it not that it is more probable that the two verses in question were added by the author of the book of Samuel, than that they formed part of the original sources, which he employed.

Vv. 4—9. (cf. 2 Sam. v. 6—10.)—V. 4. Instead of "*David and all Israel*," we find in Samuel, "*the king and his men;*" and instead of "*to Jerusalem, which is Jebus and there are the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land*," we have merely, "*to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites the inhabitants of the land*," the latter reading being probably an abbreviation of the former.—V. 5. The plural "*and the inhabitants of Jebus said*," follows naturally from the words of the previous verse; but in Samuel we find the singular "*and he said*." Although the Jebusites called out to him in a contemptuous tone, "*thou shall not come in, he took the castle of Zion*," which then received the name of *city of David* (v. 7, and chap. xiii. 13.) We have only the conclusion of the contemptuous speech of the Jebusites given here, whereas in Samuel it is reported more fully, not because the historian omitted the commencement by accident, as *Thenius* thinks, but more probably because he had another account before him, in which there was no reference to *the lame and the blind*, cf. v. 6.—V. 6. *And David said;* in Samuel we have also the words, "*in that day*," before Jebus was taken, "*David said;*" but the rest of the passage is very different. *Thenius* supposes that the difference arose from the fact that the author of the Chronicles filled up an illegible passage by the words of the text. But there is no necessity for such a conjecture. The very peculiar account in Samuel, which evidently rests upon a strictly historical basis, is clearly the earlier and more precise of the two. It may, however, be easily conceived that in other documents the name of Joab occurred in connection with the conquest of Jebus, like that of Othniel in connection with the conquest of Kirjath-Sepher (Judg. i. 12 sqq.), and that a celebrated saying of David on the occasion of its capture was there associated with Joab, on account of the deeds recorded in v. 8. Thus the same saying

was reported in two different ways; the more simple of the two, and that which presents the least difficulties, being given in the Chronicles. Joab was not appointed *chief and captain* in consequence of his bravery on the occasion of the siege of Jerusalem, he had previously been at the head of David's warriors (2 Sam. ii. 13.)—(On the difficulty presented by these parallel passages, *Keil* says, "the former clause, relating to the lame and the blind, may have been omitted by the author of the Chronicles as not bearing upon his immediate purpose, and the additional words, which occur in the second passage in the Chronicles, may originally have formed part of the account contained in the Book of Samuel, for it is universally acknowledged that there is a gap in the history at this place, *Keil*, Chr. p. 211.)—V. 7. Because David dwelt in the castle it was called the city of David; according to Samuel, David himself gave it this name.—V. 8. *Round about; from Millo, even to the circuit* (that is to say, within the circumference of a circle, which was drawn from Millo and returned to it again. In Samuel this is more briefly expressed by "David built *round about from Millo*," to which are added the words, *and inwards, i.e.*, from this circumference towards the centre. (*Thenius* explains the passage somewhat differently. He supposes that the word *inwards* refers to the northern wall of Zion, and the expression, "*round about from Millo*," to the fortification of the western, eastern, and southern sides of Zion; but *round about* can only denote the circumference of a circle which enclosed the northern side.) *Then he built the city*, by which of course we are to understand the city of David just named. *He built* must therefore mean he fortified and filled it with houses. *Millo*, a fortress probably on the north-western side of Zion, the point at which it would be most exposed to an attack, on account of its very slight elevation above the surrounding country. *And Joab restored* (Angl. margin *revived*) the rest of the city. The word יחיה is used in a similar connection in Nehem. iii. 34 (iv. 8) to describe the restoration of buildings that had been destroyed, the rebuilding being regarded as a *restoration to life*, or even as a healing (1 Kings xviii. 30.) Hence the proper rendering would be *Joab restored the rest of the city*. The fact that Joab built certain portions of the city of David is not recorded anywhere else, but there is nothing at all surprising in the fact itself.

*Thenius* would alter the words from 1 Sam. 5 according to a modified conjecture of *Kennikott*, so as to read *Joab was governor of the city*, but apart from the fact that in this case we should expect to find the expression וְיוֹאָב עַל הָעִיר (2 Sam. viii. 16), such a statement would be far less in character in a verse, which treats of the rebuilding of the city, than the clause in the text, which there is not the least occasion to alter.—V. 9. The words, *then David went, &c.*, indicate the point of time, from which his becoming great, first dates: *then* (from the conquest of Jerusalem), David *became continually greater and greater.* הָלוֹךְ before another infinitive frequently occurs in Genesis with the meaning to advance, *e.g.* Gen. viii. 3—5. *And Jehovah of Zebaoth was with him*, cf. chap. ix. 20; in 2 Sam. v. we find the fuller title *Jehovah God of Zebaoth.*

## 3. Chap. xi. 10—47.

### LIST OF DAVID'S HEROES, AND BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THEIR DEEDS.

Compare 2 Sam. xxiii. 8—39.—V. 10. For "*these are the leading heroes*" we find in Samuel "*these are the names*," probably the earlier reading, as the author of the Chronicles was especially concerned to introduce them as the *heads* of the Gibborim. In the book of Samuel the brief superscription, *these are the names of the heroes who had followed* David, is immediately succeeded by the list itself; but in the passage before us the heroes are still further described as those, *who had shown themselves strong in their association with him* (cf. Dan. x. 21) *during his rule, together with all Israel, in that they made him king*, &c. In these words the historian assigns a reason for introducing the list in question immediately after his account of the election of David as king, and the conquest of Jerusalem; namely, that they assisted in making David king. In the original form of the list and the connection in which it occurs in Samuel (2 Sam. xxiii.), there is no reference to the choice of a king, and even in the Chronicles it is only in the clause introduced into the superscription that such a reference occurs.—V. 11. The brief super-

scription in v. 10 is repeated here in a different form, viz., *and this is* (lit. these are) *the number of the heroes*. The occurrence of the word *mispar* is striking here, partly because the plural pronoun would lead us to expect a different word, and partly because the *number* of the heroes, which *is* given in 2 Sam. xxiii. 39, is not mentioned here at all. We might be inclined to suggest an alteration in the text from Ex. xv. 4, and the substitution of מִבְחַר. The passage would then read, "*these are the most distinguished of the heroes.*"

Vv. 11—14. *The three renowned heroes, Jashob'am, El'azar, and Shamma.—Jashob'am the son of Chacmoni.* There is nothing strange in the fact that the same *Jashob'am* is called in chap. xxvii. 2 a son of *Zabdiel*, for if Zabdiel belonged to the family of Chacmoni, his son might also be called a son of Chacmoni (cf. chap. xxvii. 32.) Instead of the *chief of the captains*, the reading of the Kethib (*the chief of the thirty*) is to be preferred (cf. vv. 15, 25; chap. xii. 4, 18, and xxvii. 6). *He lifted up his spear;* this is evidently the original reading, and is supported by 2 Sam. xxiii. 18. The words as they stand in the parallel passage of Samuel (v. 8) are quite unintelligible. *He brandished his spear*, continuing to raise it again and again, till the three hundred were slain *at one time*, that is in one day, and one after another. Instead of three hundred, the number given in Samuel is eight hundred, and according to all the versions that is the correct reading of the text. *Thenius* pronounces this the more probable account of the two, because the number three hundred occurs again further on in connection with Abishai (v. 20); and Jashob'am, who occupies the first place in the list, must certainly have distinguished himself by a feat superior to that of Abishai. *Ewald* on the other hand (Gesch. ii. p. 603) decides that three hundred is the original number, as it not likely that Jashob'am did more than his superior Abishai; cf. v. 21.—V. 11. El'azar the *Ahothite;* this is the correct reading, cf. chap. xxvii. 4, not *the son of the Ahothite* as in 2 Sam. xxiii. 9. He was בשלושה הגברים *among the three heroes;* the numeral, as frequently happens, is not in the construct state; but placed before the noun in the form of an adverb. We find the same construction in v. 24 and 2 Sam. xxxiii. 9 (Keri) 22. The three heroes referred to here are Jashob'am and El'azar, who are mentioned in vv. 11—12,

and Shamma, whose name, through some oversight, has been omitted from the list, see below at v. 13. It is worthy of note that these three are spoken of as pre-eminently *the three heroes. Thenius* is of opinion that if the author intended to say *the three heroes*, he would have written שלשת הגברים, like 2 Sam. xxiii. 16—17, and v. 19 of the chapter before us. But, however strange it may appear that the numeral שְׁלשָׁה occurs in two different connections in the same list, they are both grammatically admissible. Nor do we find any difficulty in the fact that the author has hitherto said nothing about a triad of heroes, for if three heroes are named one after another, and one of them is spoken of as associated with two others, no reader could possibly think of any but the three whose names are given. We see no occasion, therefore, for altering the text, as *Thenius* suggests, so as to read *he was among the Shalishim* (the knights) *of the heroes*, an alteration to which we could not assent for this reason, if for no other, that we read nothing about Shalishim anywhere else in the list in the Chronicles.—V. 13. The account of the exploit, to which he owed his renown, is introduced by the words, "*it was he who was with David, &c.*" As the omission of these words makes the passage obscure, they have probably been left out of the parallel verse in Samuel through an oversight of the copyist. According to the *Septuagint* (Ald. Compl.) they did originally form part of the text.—*Pas-dammim:* the same place as we meet with in 1 Sam. xvii. 1 under the name of *Ephes-dammim*. It is there described as situated between Shocoh and Azeka, that is, in the western districts of the province of Judah. The name is left out of the list in 2 Sam. xxiii., but there are several places, especially v. 9, in which the text of that chapter must be amended from the Chronicles.—After the words, "*and the Philistines were gathered together to battle,*" several verses have fallen out of our text, which for the sake of the connection we give from 2 Sam. xxiii. 9—11: *then the Israelites went up* (leaving the battle-field to retreat into the mountains) *whereas he stood firm. And he smote the Philistines till his hand was numbed, and his hand clung to the sword. And Jehovah effected a great deliverance that day, and the people returned* (from their flight) *to him for the sake of the spoil* (the victory having been decided by him alone.) *And*

*after him followed Shamma ben Age the Hararite, and the Philistines had assembled near Lechi,* viz., at the spot where Samson once smote the Philistines (Judg. xv. 9 sqq.). The continuation is given in our text: *and there was a piece of land there full of barley.* The omission of so long a passage, which has fallen out of the text through an oversight, was probably occasioned by the recurrence of precisely the same words, "*and the Philistines had assembled together to battle,*" in such close connection (2 Sam. xxiii. 9 and 11). For *barley* we find in Samuel *lentils.* The difference probably arose from a transposition in the letters of the original word. It was of great importance to preserve the field of barley, which the Philistines wanted to destroy, but the Israelites took to flight.—V. 14. "*Then* Shamma *maintained his ground in the midst of the field, and saved it, and smote the Philistines.*" We have rendered the three verbs in the singular instead of the plural; we find them in the singular in Samuel, and the context absolutely requires it.—And Jehovah *saved them.* The word *saved* is not inappropriate here, but as the parallel passage in Samuel reads *Jehovah wrought* a great victory, and the rendering of the Septuagint in the passage before us is *καὶ ἐποίησε*, the latter must be regarded as the original reading. (The discrepancy between the two passages is explained by *Keil* in precisely the same way as by *Bertheau.* He says: "in both passages there are evidently copyists' errors and corruptions, *e.g.* in v. 13 of the Chronicles nearly two whole verses have been left out between the words 'to battle,' and 'where was a piece of ground.' The missing verses are found in 2 Sam. xxiii. 9—11. Thus, through the omission of the name of Shamma, a heroic exploit is ascribed to Eleazar, which was really performed by Shamma." *Keil* Chronik. p. 211, 212).

Vv. 15—19. *Account of the three heroes, who fetched water for David.*—V. 15. שְׁלוֹשָׁה (*three*) occurs in 2 Sam. (Keri) also without the article. We might easily be induced to conjecture, that the article *was* originally prefixed to the numeral, as the names of three heroes have just been given, and it is a very natural supposition that we have here an account of a brave exploit, which was performed in concert by the same three, especially when we consider that, according to the superscription in Samuel, it was the intention of the author to give the *names*

of the heroes mentioned by him, and here we have no names at all. Still we have some hesitation about inserting the article, for the more probable supposition is, that three different heroes are referred to here. In the verse before us they are more particularly described as *three of the thirty captains*, and such a description would have been unnecessary in the case of the three already known, Jashobam, El'azar, and Shamma. As the word שלשים is followed by ראש in the singular, it is evident that the former must be the numeral 30. It is important to observe this if we are desirous of holding fast the original signification of the word. —*And three of the thirty went down to David on the rock at the cave of Adullam;* the rock was that upon which the fortress stood (v. 16), and the cave of Adullam must either have been in the rock itself or somewhere in the neighbourhood. The *valley of Rephaim* was to the west of Jerusalem, how far it ran in a southern direction we cannot exactly determine.—V. 16. The Philistines, who were encamped in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, had pushed forward an outpost as far as to Bethlehem, and according to v. 18 it was stationed in front of that town.—V. 17. There is very beautiful water not far from Bethlehem, but *Robinson* looked in vain for a well *in the gate* of the town (ii. p. 378). At length he found one inside the town, that was connected with the aqueduct to the south of Bethlehem. About a quarter of an hour's walk to the north-east of the town there is a large deep cistern or cave, which is now dry, with three or four small openings cut in the rock. According to tradition this was the well, whose water David desired to drink. The description given here, according to which there was a well in the gate, does not agree with either the situation of the wells or the position of the gate in modern Bethlehem.—V. 18. *They broke through the camp*, not the camp referred to in v. 15, for if this were meant, the valley of Rephaim must have lain between the fortress and the town of Bethlehem. *Thenius* infers from this passage that it did extend thus far to the south, but such a supposition is not favoured by other accounts of the situation of the valley, and in that case there would have been no necessity for the historian to say anything of the outpost in Bethlehem, which is expressly mentioned in v. 16 as distinct from the camp referred to in v. 15. The camp, through which they broke, was the encampment of

this outpost, which kept possession of the space in front of the gate of the town.—*Then they brought it* (the water) *to David; and he poured it on the ground to Jehovah,* thereby confessing that the water, which had been procured by the three heroes at the risk of their life, was far too valuable to be employed for any ordinary purpose.—V. 19. *Shall I drink the blood of these men in their souls.* (The verb "shall I drink" is omitted from 2 Sam. xxiii., but undoubtedly formed part of the original text.) *The expression blood in their souls* reminds us of Gen. ix. 4; Lev. iii. 17, vii. 26, xvii. 10 sqq., xix. 26 seq.; Deut. xii. 6, and of the command not to eat flesh in its blood, or in its soul and blood. Of these passages, Lev. xvii. 11 and 14 seem the most likely to throw light upon the verse before us, for the phrase *blood in the soul* and *in its soul* apparently corresponds to the expression employed here. But we are unable to bring the words "*blood in its soul*" into harmony with the more definite expressions which we find used on other occasions. According to these the soul is in the blood or the soul is the blood, and the difficult passages in Leviticus (xvii. 11 and 14) must be similarly explained. The blood is the seat of the *Nephesh*, but we do not see how this can be also the seat of the blood. The phrase *blood in their souls,* therefore, is still enigmatical; *blood with their souls,* as the earlier expositors rendered it, is not in the text, for בְּ does not mean *with.* As the words "*in their souls*" only occur once in 2 Sam. xxiii. 17, we are of opinion that in the original text of the Chronicles also it was only written once, and that it has been repeated by mistake. The question, "*shall I drink the blood of these men?*" is fully explained by the words which follow: *when for their souls they have brought the water (i.e.,* having given their souls as it were as the price of the water). The water, which had been obtained at the risk of their lives, or by offering up their souls, is valued at the price of their souls; but the soul is equivalent to the blood, and therefore to drink the water would be the same as drinking the blood of the men. But if blood could not be shed upon the altar, it was to be poured out upon the ground like water, Deut. xii. 16; and thus did David take the water, which he regarded as equivalent to the blood of his heroes, and pour it upon the ground. In the parallel passage in Samuel the words read thus: (shall I drink) *the blood*

*of the men who went at the risk of their lives;* but in the text of the Chronicles the clause, *who went at the risk of their lives*, is so altered as to assign the reason, *for they have brought the water for their souls*, and thus an explanation is furnished of the bold expression *the blood of the heroes.* It must not be supposed that David acted as he did with any reference to the prohibition to eat blood; still it was necessary to mention this prohibition, since the representation, which it gives of the importance and nature of the blood, serves to strengthen our explanation.

Vv. 20—25. *Abishai and Benaiah.*—V. 20. *Abishai* was one of the three sons of Zeruiah. Like Jashobam, he lifted up his spear against 300 men and slew them. *He was the head of the Sheloshah*, or, as it is stated in v. 21, *he was their prince.* If we take Sheloshah here to be a numeral, we must distinguish between these three, of whom he was the head, and the other three to whom he did not attain (v. 21). It is true that we read of twice three heroes in the previous verses, and it might therefore be supposed that Abishai was the head of the three mentioned in vv. 15—19, whilst he was inferior to the three referred to in vv. 11—14, viz., Jashobam, El'azar, and Shamma. But, however natural it may appear to reconcile the statements contained in the verses before us, by supposing that there were two distinct triads of heroes, it could easily be shown that this would not answer the purpose intended. The difficulties, in our opinion, can only be removed on the supposition that Sheloshah has two different meanings in these verses, viz., that of a numeral *three*, and that of an abstract noun *the whole of the thirty.* Our reason for giving the latter meaning to the word is founded upon a comparison of v. 21 with v. 25, and of 2 Sam. xxiii. 19 with v. 23, for it is evident from these verses that Sheloshah and Sheloshim are employed to denote a larger company, in which both Abishai and Benaiah occupied a prominent position. Hence we should render the passage in question thus: *he was the head of the Sheloshah-company, and to him* (לא is another mode of writing לוֹ, according to the Keri, to v. 24, and to 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, 23) *there was a name in the Sheloshah-company, i.e.*, he was one of its most distinguished members.—V. 21. *Of the three among two he was regarded;* very obscure words, which are sometimes interpreted as meaning: *he was renowned among the three of the*

*second rank* (Vulgate, *et inter tres secundos inclytus*), or *of the three he was renowned above two* (LXX. ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς δύο ἔνδοξος), in other words he was more renowned than the other two who were associated with him in the same triad. But the expression *among two* does not occur in 2 Samuel xxiii. 14; and it may very possibly have been interpolated here from a wish to elucidate the narrative by distinguishing one triad from the other. Moreover, there is no such expression in v. 25 of this chapter, where exactly the same sentence occurs again. Hence we must adopt the reading of 2 Sam. xxiii., "*of the Shelosha-company he was truly renowned* (we take הֲכִי in the sense in which it occurs in Genesis xxvii. 36, xxix. 15, cf. 2 Sam. ix. 1), *and he became their leader, but to the three* (mentioned in vv. 11—14), *he did not attain*" (compare v. 25.)—V. 22. *Benaiah* (chap. xviii. 17, xxvii. 6) *the son of a valiant man.* This can hardly have been the description given of Benaiah, who is called the *son of Jehoiada* immediately before. The word *Ben* (son) is out of place here. It is Benaiah himself who is called a *valiant man, great in deeds.—Kabzeel:* a town in the south of Judah, Josh. xv. 21; Nehem. xi. 25.—The word *Ben*, which we dropt before "a valiant man," should evidently have stood as a plural before אריאל: which would then read thus: *he slew the two sons of Ariel of Moab.* Ariel, *lion of God*, appears from this to have been a title of honour given to the king of Moab. This feat of Benaiah was probably performed in the war between David and the Moabites, recorded in 2 Sam. viii. 2. *He also went down* (into the well) *and slew the lion in the midst of the well, when snow had fallen;* that is to say, in winter-time, when a heavy fall of snow had brought the lion into the neighbourhood of the dwelling houses, where it had taken refuge in a well.—*He also slew the Egyptian man, a man of stature;* the Septuagint renders this, after 2 Sam. xxiii. 21, ἄνδρα ὁρατόν, *a man of renown:* either a *distinguished man* or *a man to look at* (a great man). The latter is the more probable meaning from the next clause, "five cubits high," which does not occur in Samuel. *And in his hand was a spear*, according to the passage before us *like a weaver's beam*, but according to the *Septuagint* rendering of 2 Sam. xxiii. 21, ὡς ξύλον διαβάθρας. In the latter passage there must originally have been some expression

of this kind, for the mere fact that a spear was in his hand would not be worthy of any special notice; and there is something so peculiar in the comparison between a heavy spear and a beam from a bridge, that it was most probably the original reading.—*And he went down* to the place of combat (1 Sam. xxvi. 10, xxix. 4) *with the stick, sc.* which he happened to have in his hand at the time.—V. 24. The word *Shelosha* in the text is written *plene;* according to v. 20, however, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 18, it should be written *defective: he was renowned in the Shelosha-company.* The words of the text mean, *he was renowned among the three heroes,* cf. v. 12.—V. 25. *Among the Sheloshim,* or in the Shelosha-company, *behold he was renowned, but he did not attain to the three* (cf. v. 21), *and David set him over his body-guard.* The same expression occurs in 2 Sam. xxiii. 23 (cf. 1 Sam. xxii. 14), and it is evident from 2 Sam. viii. 18 and xx. 23, that the Kreti and Pleti were the guard intended. This body-guard was a small, distinct corps, which received its orders direct from the king, and remained in attendance upon his person, in constant readiness to execute his commands. Hence *his obedience* (the literal meaning of the word), those who were immediately subject to him, were not placed upon the same footing as the rest of the troops, but held a position peculiar to themselves. It is only in this passage and the parallel verse in Samuel that the word occurs as a technical term with this precise meaning, though it is also found in 1 Sam. xxii. 14 and Is. xi. 14, and for that very reason we should be careful how we think of altering it.

On reviewing the whole section, vv. 11—25, the question arises, whether the *Shalishim,* &c., referred to here, are the same as the *Shalishim* or *chariot-soldiers,* who are occasionally mentioned (*e.g.,* in 2 Kings x. 25) by the side of the *Razim* or *runners,* and one of whom was frequently employed as a kind of adjutant in immediate attendance upon the king (2 Kings vii. 2, 17, 19, ix. 25, xv. 25 cf.; 2 Chr. viii. 9; Ezek. xxiii. 15, 23). In our opinion the question must be answered in the negative; for whilst the words *Shelosha, Shelosha haggeborim,* and *Sheloshim* occur very frequently, *Shalishim* is only used once, viz., in v. 11 in the Keri, and even there the reading of the Kethib, *Sheloshim,* which is so strongly supported by the following verses, ought not to be relinquished. Now if we consider how easy it

is to account for the opinion that the celebrated warriors, the Shalishim, were referred to here, and bear in mind the frequency with which *vav* and *yod* are interchanged, we shall feel that there is very little weight in the passages in which *Shalishim* and *Shalishi* occur, especially as the reading is not well established in any one of these passages, *Sheloshim* or *Shelosha* being invariably found in the Kethib or else in the parallel passages. Hence we cannot subscribe to the opinion of *Thenius*, who starts with the supposition that the persons described in this section belonged to the warriors who were known by the name of the Shalishim. "The frequent occurrence of this word," he says, "in the section before us has escaped the notice of commentators solely because it has been changed into Sheloshim or Shelosha, which has been erroneously regarded as the true reading." We are forced to adopt exactly the opposite conclusion, and to pronounce *Sheloshim* and *Shelosha* correct. The connection, already pointed out, between the two readings would be quite sufficient to justify us in coming to such a conclusion, but to this it must also be added that, if we remember rightly, the Shalishim are not mentioned anywhere else in the history of David, whereas the Sheloshim are spoken of in 1 Chr. xi. 42, xii. 4, xxvii. 6, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 24. Now there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the word *Sheloshim*. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 and 1 Chr. xi. 15 it means *thirty*, and denotes a company of distinguished warriors, whilst particular heroes are not infrequently described as belonging to it. They stood at the head of other warriors as chiefs, and are called the thirty captains or heads in 1 Chr. xi. 15; Jashobam was the head of the thirty, v. 11, and Abishai also was their head and prince, v. 20. The plural form Sheloshim is used interchangeably with the feminine singular *Sheloshah* (compare v. 25 and v. 21), and however strange this interchange may appear, it is possible to explain it, since the plural Sheloshim, when used to denote a particular company of thirty individuals, was regarded in fact as a substantive, which might be formed directly from Shelosh through the feminine termination. So much at any rate is indisputable, that Sheloshah does not mean *three* in every place in which it occurs in the verses before us, but also means a *company of thirty*, and it would be an arbitrary thing on our part to assume that the reading is false, and to substitute Shelo-

shim, wherever it is used in the latter signification. If, however, we give to Sheloshah the same meaning as to Sheloshim, the verses in our opinion may be easily understood without any alteration, the only ambiguity arising from the fact that *Sheloshah* is also used with the meaning *three*. In the list in question, then, after amending the text from 2 Sam. xxiii., we find, *in the first place*, the names of *three heroes* : Jashob'am, *the head of the thirty*, El'azar, who also belonged to these *three heroes*, and Shamma. *Secondly*, in vv. 16--19 a short account is given of three, whose names are not given, and who did not belong *to the thirty heroes*. In v. 19 they are described as *three heroes*. *Thirdly*, in vv. 20—25 two heroes are named. The first is Abishai the head of the *Shelosha* (the company of thirty), who was renowned and *distinguished in the Shelosha* (or, according to v. 25 among the thirty). He was also *their leader*, but did not attain to the *three* heroes named before. The second is Benaiah (cf. chap. xxvii. 6), who was *renowned and distinguished among the thirty*, but did not attain to the three heroes already named. It is somewhat striking that, according to this, Jashob'am the *head of the thirty* and Abishai the *head of the Shelosha* held precisely the same rank. But the latter is also called the prince of the thirty, and hence, if there be an objection to the supposition that they held the same office at different times, the one succeeding to it on the death of the other, the title of "*head*" may have been given to the one because he was the most distinguished for his bravery, and to the other because he was the actual leader. We have no account in the historical books of the exact rank of these thirty in David's army. It might be conjectured that they were the leaders of the six hundred men who are spoken of in 1 Sam. xxiii. 13, xxv. 13, xxx. 10, and 2 Sam. xv. 18; in which case there would have been an officer for every twenty men. These six hundred men formed the body guard of David, as we find from 2 Sam. xvi. 6, and were called in a peculiar sense הַגִּבֹּרִים (the mighty men), 2 Sam. x. 7, xvi. 6, xx. 7, cf. 1 Kings i. 8, 10; see *Thenius* in 2 Sam. xv. 18, *Ewald*, Gesh. des. V. Israel p. 600 sqq.

Vv. 26—47. *List of forty-eight of the leaders in David's army.* (As we have here merely a list of names, and nearly all of them are entirely unknown, we omit the author's notes on this passage

with the exception of the following remarks with which he concludes.—Tr.) If we add the name of Elika, which has evidently fallen out of v. 27, as we may see from 2 Sam. xxiii. 25, the number of the names from v. 26 to Uriah the Hittite in v. 41 is thirty-two, and from v. 41 to 47 sixteen, making together forty-eight, a number which is in itself a proof of the completeness of the list. The names of the three heroes (vv. 11—14) and nine of the names which occur in vv. 26—30, twelve in all, are given again in chap. xxvii. as the names of the leaders of the twelve divisions of the army.—Of the heroes mentioned in vv. 26—41 the greater part belonged to the provinces of Judah and Benjamin, as the list itself clearly shows; on the other hand the sixteen names which occur in vv. 41—47 are all associated with places that are altogether unknown, or with cities and districts on the east of the Jordan. The tribes inhabiting the north of Palestine do not appear to have furnished any leaders, and even Ephraim is but feebly represented.

## 4. Chap. xii. 1—22.

### LIST OF THOSE WHO ATTACHED THEMSELVES TO DAVID DURING THE LIFETIME OF SAUL.

Three separate lists, which are only found here, vv. 1—7, vv. 8—17, and vv. 19—22. The men are classified according to the time of their going over to David.

Vv. 1—7. *Benjaminites and men of Judah, who came to David when he was in Ziklag* (cf. 1 Sam. xxvii.)—V. 1. *He was still restrained from the face;* a brief mode of expression for: at the time when he was still prohibited from appearing in the presence of Saul. *War auxiliaries;* according to vv. 17, 18, 21, 22, an honourable title given to those who had been ready to assist David in his previous wars.—V. 2. (cf. Judg. iii. 15, and xix. seq.) נשקי קשת (2 Chr. xvii. 17) men who *shot with the bow*, practised archers like דרכי קשת, chap viii. 40. *With the right and left hand*, they were *skilled in* (throwing) *stones and* (shooting) *arrows upon the bow.—Brethren of Saul;* are they called Saul's brethren because they were Benjaminites, *i.e.*, mem-

bers of the same tribe, or were they more closely related to him? As the words "*of Benjamin*" follow immediately after, a comparison of v. 29 with the verse before us, will show that we must decide in favour of the former.—V. 4. *Ishmaya of Gibeon* (2 Sam. xxi. 1 sqq.) *a hero among the thirty and leader of the thirty* (chap. xi. 42). In the MSS. and ancient editions, even that of R. Norzi, the 4th verse terminates here. It is evident from chap. viii. 29 and ix. 35 that not only the Canaanites, who were made servants of the congregation (Josh. ix.) but members of the tribe of Benjamin also dwelt at Gibeon. Of *Gadera;* are we to understand by this the town, which, according to Josh. xv. 36, was situated in the lowlands of Judah? As Gedor is mentioned immediately afterwards in v. 7, we must conclude that the list contains men of Judah as well as Benjamin.—V. 6. *The Korahites;* according to chap. ix. 19, 31, those who descended from Korah. As the name Korah occurs in chap. ii. 43, in the list of the tribe of Judah, but is not found anywhere else among the Benjaminites, and as we cannot suppose them to have been the Korahites of the tribes of Levi, we conclude that those mentioned here were a family of Judah. It is somewhat strange that we should find a plural form and the name of a family by the side of adjectives formed from the names of towns.—V. 7. *Gedor,* a town in Judah, to the southwest of Bethlehem (cf. chap. iv. 4).

Vv. 8—18. *List of men of the tribe of Gad, and an account of certain men of Judah and Benjamin, who attached themselves to David when he was staying in the fortress.*—Vv. 8—15. *The Gadites.* V. 8. *They separated themselves* (from the rest of the Gadites who were on the side of Saul).—*To the fortress towards the desert;* cf. *v.* 16, chap. xi. 16; 1 Sam. xxii. 4 and xxiii. 14. *Men of might;* vid. chap. xi. 26.—Strong and bold, *looking like lions* (2 Sam. i. 23), *and like roes hurrying* over *the hills* (2 Sam. ii. 18). The plural צבאים, a later form for צְבָיִים.—V. 14. *Leaders of the army;* cf. v. 21, princes in the army. *One for a hundred the small one, and the greater for a thousand; i.e.,* of the eleven heroes named, the weakest could stand against a hundred men, and the strongest against a thousand (cf. Lev. xxvi. 8). This is the explanation given by early Jewish expositors and also in the Septuagint. On the other hand, the *Vulgate* renders the passage *novissimus centum militibus praeerat et maximus mille,* but

the contrast between small and great does not favour this explanation, moreover if this were the meaning of the words, we should expect to find the preposition עַל rather than לְ. Moreover, the former rendering is decidedly favoured by the position of the word *one* at the commencement of the sentence immediately before לְמֵאָה, by which the contrast is heightened between *one* and *a hundred*. The expressions employed in v. 8 to describe their strength and swiftness remind us directly of similar expressions which are applied in the historical books to heroes of the time of David, and were undoubtedly taken from the original sources employed by our historian. Hence the question has been asked whether the words of the verse before us were also found there or were appended by the historian himself. It is impossible to give a positive answer to this question. But we are of opinion that the historian found them in the original record; for they have a very peculiar, we might almost say poetical character; no such expression occurs anywhere else in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, as a description of personal bravery; and such passages as Lev. xxvi. 8 furnish a proof that in very early times extraordinary bravery and success in war were so described.—*It was they who went over the Jordan;* probably at the time when they separated from the rest of the Gadites and had to fight their way through the supporters of Saul to get to David.—*When it filled over all its banks:* as the verb filled is without an object, we must interpret the Piel as meaning *it made an overflowing.* In Josh. iii. 15, we find the participle Kal. *In the first month, i.e.*, in spring, when an immense body of water generally rushes in torrents down the Jordan to the Dead Sea. *And they put to flight all the valleys both on the east and on the west;* for though the river was swollen it did not prevent them from attacking their enemies on the western bank after they had defeated those on the east.—Vv. 16—18. *The men of Benjamin and Judah,* who joined David in the fortress, were no doubt mentioned by name in the original sources, as well as the men of Gad, but the historian does not give their names, probably because many of the men, whom David is said in v. 18 to have made captains in his army, had been named in the list already given in chap. xi. We have merely an account of the conversation which took place previous to their admission into David's

army.—V. 17. *He went out to meet them*, vid. chap. xiv. 8. לְיָחַד only occurs in this passage: *there shall be to me towards you a heart for fellowship*, I will have with you *one* heart (compare v. 38, "one heart," and v. 33, "without a heart and a heart") and remain true to you. *And if* ye have come *to deal treacherously with me on behalf of my adversaries* (to deliver me to my adversaries) *although there is nothing wrong in my hands* (somewhat differently in Job xvi. 17, and Is. liii. 9), *may the God of our fathers behold and punish* (2 Chr. xxiv. 22); the God of our fathers is the God who has always manifested himself in Israel as the protector of the innocent, and who therefore will not let the men go unpunished if they have any evil design against David.—V. 18. *The Spirit came into Amasai.* In other places the usual expression is the Spirit of God (2 Chr. xxiv. 20), here we have "the Spirit" alone, as the intention of the author was chiefly to give prominence to the fact that Amasai spoke under the influence of inspiration, and not after reflection and with hesitation. The whole context is sufficient to show that the inspiration did not proceed from an evil source. Among the earlier expositors some regarded the spirit as a spirit of bravery (*Syriac*), others as a spirit of willingness and vehement desire (*Kimchi*), others again as a spirit of impatience; *Lavater* as the Spirit of God which impelled him to give the answer he did. The name *Amasai* reminds us of Amasah, the son of Abigail the sister of David (chap. ii. 17), and also of Abishai, the son of Zeruiah the sister of David (chap. ii. 16, xi. 20), though not so directly of the latter. Earlier expositors have expressed the opinion that he was one of these two, and as it is probable that Amasai, who played so important part on this occasion, appears elsewhere in the history of David, there is certainly some ground for the conjecture that he was the same person as the Amasa of the books of Samuel.—*To thee, O David:* we have no difficulty in completing the sentence by "we belong;" thine we are, *and with thee, O son of Jesse*, we will fight in concert. *Peace be to thee, and peace to every one who helps thee, for thy God*, who has stood by thy side in thy former successful wars (1 Sam. xviii. 12, 14), *helpeth thee*, and will not forsake thee. The last words of the verse, *then David received them, and placed them at the head of*

*the army*, are to be regarded as the words of the historian, since ויקבלם is a word belonging to a later age.

Vv. 19—22. *List of seven men of the tribe of Manasseh*, who joined David, when he was dismissed by the Philistines from their army, on the occasion of their last battle with Saul, and returned to Ziklag; cf. 1 Sam. xxix.—V. 19. *They fell to David; v.* xx.; 2 Kings xxv. 11. *And David and his men did not help the Philistines* (1 Sam. xxix. 2). *Upon advisement* (Prov. xx. 18), that is to say with forethought and after deliberation, *the princes of the Philistines had sent him away.* בראשינו (according to 1 Sam. xxix. 4) *for our heads*, inasmuch as he will not hesitate to give up our heads as the price of a friendly reception on the part of Saul, *he will fall away to his master, Saul.*—V. 20. *When he returned to Ziklag;* they probably went over to him before the battle, and accompanied him to Ziklag. *Ewald* (Gesch. ii. p. 569) imagines that they did not go over till after Saul's defeat. I think, however, that a comparison of the words "as he went to Ziklag" with 1 Sam. xxix. 11 compels us to decide in favour of the former, though the statements are not made with such precision and clearness as to prevent any uncertainty in this respect. The seven men were *heads of the thousands belonging to Manasseh*, that is to say, they were heads of the larger military divisions of the tribe of Manasseh; compare the princes of thousands, who are mentioned in chap. xv. 25 by the side of the elders of Israel, and the passages in which the princes over thousands are named along with those over hundreds, chap. xiii. 1, xxvi. 26, xxvii. 1, &c. It is evident from the Pentateuch (*e.g.* Num. xxxi. 14) that in the very earliest times the tribes were divided into hundreds and thousands, and that the heads of these divisions had a settled official position in the general organisation of the tribes.—V. 21. *They assisted in concert with David against the army* of the Amalekites; thus taking part in the first military expedition, which was undertaken by David, after his return to Ziklag. This explanation of the brief and unintelligible words of the text is founded upon 1 Sam. xxx. 8, 15, where the same word הגדוד is used to describe the army of the Amalekites. The *Vulgate* renders the passage *hi praebuerunt auxilium David adversus latrunculos*, the *Septuagint*, *καὶ αὐτοὶ συνε-*

*μάχησαν τῷ Δαυὶδ ἐπὶ τὸν Γεδδούρ,* we have here a different reading of the last word, which was regarded as a proper name. The question still remains, whether הַגְּדוּד in the verse before us refers to the seven Manassites, or to all the heroes spoken of in vv. 1—20. As it was not the Manassites alone who took part in the attack upon Amalek, but David obtained the victory with *all* his army (the 600 men of 1 Sam. xxx. 9), which undoubtedly included those who are named in vv. 1—18,—a marked distinction being made between those who attached themselves to David, and assisted him during the earlier period (the helpers of David mentioned in vv. 1, 17, 22) and those who came to him at Hebron, v. 23,—moreover, as the general statement made in v. 22 is connected by כִּי with v. 21, we conclude that vv. 21 and 22 are appended as a supplementary remark to the whole of the preceding list: *and they,* viz., all those named after v. 1, *assisted . . . for they were all heroic warriors, and they were princes in the army,* and thus it came to pass that David was at the head of a powerful army even when he was in Ziklag,—v. 22, *for daily there came to David to help him* (so many, that the number increased) *to a great camp like a camp of God.* The simile evidently refers to its size: cf. "the mountains and cedars of God," Ps. xxxvi. 7, lxxx. 11; Jonah iii. 3, is not so evidently a case in point.

## 5. Chap. xii. 23—40.

### NUMBER OF THE WARRIORS WHO ELECTED DAVID KING IN HEBRON.

We have here a more detailed description of the same assembly, of which a brief notice is found in chap. xi. 1—3. From what source the present account was derived it is impossible to say. It is probable, however, that we have here an extract from a complete list of the warriors, who assembled in Hebron, for the superscription in v. 23 announces a statement of *the number of the men equipped for the army, who assembled at Hebron;* whereas the verses which follow contain not the number of the heads, but the number of warriors belonging to the different tribes, and it is

quite as an exception that we find the leaders of the tribe of Levi mentioned in vv. 26—28. The supposition that the heading can be brought into harmony with the list itself, by rendering מספרי ראשי the *number of heads* or individuals, is incorrect, for ראשי before החלוץ, according to the settled usage of the language, always means the heads or leaders of the army, and the word גֻּלְגְּלֹת is employed to denote the number of heads in the sense of individuals, *e.g.*, 1 Chr. xxiii. 3, 24. Our only resource then is to assume that the heading originally belonged to a list, which was arranged throughout like vv. 26—28, *i.e.* which contained the names and number of the chiefs and also the number of the warriors. *To turn the kingdom;* cf. chap. x. 14.—*According to the mouth of Jehovah:* cf. according to the word of Jehovah, chap. xi. 3, 10.—V. 24. The account commences with the two tribes inhabiting the southern portion of the land, Judah and Simeon; they are followed by Levi, whose leading forces and principal representatives were undoubtedly concentrated in the province of Judah and had attached themselves to David. Proceeding in a northerly direction the list embraces the rest of the tribes in the country to the west of the Jordan, and concludes with the two tribes and a half on the east of the river.—V. 27. *Jehoiada* is called *the prince for Aaron.* This, cannot mean that he was the *high priest,* as the office of high priest was filled by Abiathar (1 Sam. xxiii. 9). הנגיד must, therefore, mean the leader of the warriors of the house of Aaron. It has been thought that this Jehoiada was the father of Benaiah, chap. xi. 22.—*Zadok,* who was still but a youth, may very well have been the descendant of the El'azar mentioned in chap. v. 34, who was appointed to the office of high priest during the reign of Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 26.—*And his father's house two and twenty princes,* all of whom belonged to the family of El'azar, which was, therefore, very large and powerful at that time.—V. 29. Benjamin sent only 3000 men, a comparatively small number, *for hitherto* (chap. ix. 18) *the mass, i.e.,* the greater number of the Benjaminites had been careful guardians of the house of Saul. It is worthy of notice that, according to this statement, even after the death of Ishbosheth, a large part of the tribe of Benjamin hesitated to acknowledge David as king.—V. 30. On comparing chap. v. 24 we might be led to conjecture, that the

words "*heads of*" originally stood before the "house of their fathers," were it not that the number had just been stated at 20,800. And not only are they all described as *brave heroes*, but as *celebrated men*, which is somewhat remarkable; a similar description occurs in v. 31. לְבֵית אֲבוֹתָם can hardly mean celebrated men of their fathers'-houses, or in their fathers' houses, but arranged *according to their fathers'-houses* (chap. v. 13.)—V. 31. The half-tribe of Manasseh on the west of the Jordan furnished 18,000 men, who *were levied by name* (chap. xvi. 41; Num. i. 17) *to go and make David king*. The meaning of these words probably is, that there were lists drawn up containing the names of the whole 18,000.—V. 32. To the statement that from Issachar there came to Hebron *men who were wise* (2 Chr. ii. 12) *with regard to the times so as to see what Israel ought to do*, we find nothing analogous in the whole of the Old Testament. Some of the earlier expositors infer from it, that the tribe of Issachar was distinguished above the rest of the tribes for an acquaintance with astronomical and physical science, by which it was enabled to predict the course of events. The learning of this tribe is no doubt particularly referred to here, because it was a matter of great importance that not only the military tribes, but the tribe which was celebrated for its scientific attainments and also for its sound judgment in political questions, declared for David. We have no means, however, of explaining how it was that Issachar attained its pre-eminence in this respect, and how the "strong ass" of Gen. xlix. 14 became the wise one in discerning times.—*Two hundred heads and all their brethren acting according to their mouth; i.e.*, cheerfully following their commands, Gen. xli. 40; Num. iv. 27; Deut. xxi. 5.—V. 33. ולעדר only occurs here and in v. 38; in the same connection in both passages. It has been supposed by some to mean: to fall into rank, by others to congregate together. The expression *without heart and heart* (a double heart) suits these explanations very well, as *v.* 38 clearly shows: falling into rank, or congregating together *not with a double heart, i.e.*, with a firm and faithful mind. Nine MSS. read לַעֲזֹר *to help with a faithful heart;* LXX. *βοηθῆσαι τῷ Δαυὶδ οὐ χεροκένως*, *Vulg. venerunt in auxilium non in corde duplici.* It does not follow from these renderings that the Septua-

gint and the Vulgate adopted the latter reading, they may have taken the reading of our text and translated it *to help* according to the Aramaean form. Vv. 17, 21, and 22 appear to favour this rendering; but (1) the meaning *to help* is totally unsuitable to *v.* 38; (2) there is no ground for attaching such a meaning to the verb עֹדֵר in this passage, seeing that the root עזר *to help* occurs several times in the chapter before us; (3) it would be necessary to alter the reading in this verse and *v.* 38 and we may well hesitate before assuming that the text is thus faulty in two places; and hence we are forced to the conclusion that the received reading must be retained as the correct one.—V. 38. Concluding remarks with reference to the whole section from *v.* 23.—*And all the rest of Israel were agreed in heart* (2 Chr. xxx. 12), *i.e.*, had one common wish, *to make David king.* —V. 39. *Their brethren brought them provisions;* Gen. xliii. 16; 2 Chr. xxxv. 14 seq.—V. 40. *And those also who were living near them* (Deut. xiii. 8), in fact not merely those who dwelt in the immediate neighbourhood of Hebron, but those who lived as far off as the borders of the provinces of *Issachar, Zebulon, and Naphtali,* supplied the Israelites, who were assembled in Hebron, with food, without any regard to distinctions of tribe and other associations, bringing a great abundance of provisions upon beasts of burden, for *there was joy in Israel,* and therefore every one did his best to make the assembly in Hebron a festival of rejoicing (cf. 2 Chr. xxx. 23 sqq.). According to the account given in the verses before us more than 300,000 armed men took part in the assembly at Hebron. We are not surprised at the large number of Israelites who took part in this assembly, but we are struck with the disproportion in the numbers of the representatives of the different tribes. Judah, the tribe of David, which had been from the earliest times the most numerous and powerful tribe, sent 6,800 men; from Zebulon, on the other hand, there were 50,000. Naphtali contributed 1,000 princes at the head of 37,000 warriors, and the two tribes and a half from the east of the Jordan sent 120,000 men. How did it happen that Zebulon and Naphtali, two tribes which never played an important part in the history of Israel, were so numerously represented, whilst Judah sent so comparatively small a band of warriors? The question immediately arises

whether the numbers are precise and accurate as we have them here. But we are unable to answer this question, as the account contained in these verses furnishes no test, by which the accuracy of the various details may be determined, and the number of those who were present at the assembly in Hebron is not mentioned anywhere else in the Old Testament.

## 6. Chap. xiii.—xvi.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT IS TAKEN TO THE HOUSE OF OBED-EDOM AND REMAINS THERE THREE MONTHS, CHAP. XIII. (ACCOUNT OF DAVID'S PREPARATIONS FOR BUILDING A HOUSE, OF HIS FAMILY AND OF HIS WARS WITH THE PHILISTINES, CHAP. XIV.), THE ARK IS THEN CARRIED BY THE LEVITES TO JERUSALEM IN A SOLEMN PROCESSION, CHAPS. XV. AND XVI.

1. Chap. xiii. compare 2 Sam. vi. 1—11, where verses 2—11 correspond almost word for word to vv. 6—14 of this chapter; but instead of vv. 1—5 with its elaborate account of the meeting in which it was resolved to fetch back the ark of the covenant, we find in Samuel merely a brief notice in v. 1 of an assembly of the armed forces of David.

Vv. 1—5. V. 1. *And David consulted* (cf. 2 Chr. x. 6; xxx. 2) *with the leaders of the thousands* (chap. xv. 25) *and the hundreds, with all the princes.* The preposition *lamed* is used before words which briefly describe the entire body of the persons referred to (cf. Gen. xxiii. 10). V. 2. *The whole congregation of Israel,* therefore, is the assembly of leaders and princes, *i.e.*, of the representatives of the congregation. In consequence of their resolution David afterwards convened the whole of the Israelites. V. 5. *If it seem good unto you;* a phrase frequently met with in the later historical books, Neh. ii. 5, 7; Esther i. 19; iii. 9. *And* (if it be) *from Jehovah our God* (Gen. xxiv. 50), if it has taken place at his instigation and with his consent. נפרצה before נשלחה is only met with here; the primary meaning of the former, *to break through,* is modified into that of *rapid execution, we will send quickly and without further consideration.* *To*

*our brethren ;* the preposition עַל is chosen, because the *sending* involves the notion of commanding. After "*with them*" we must supply the words "*we will send.*" V. 4. *To do is thus*, in other words, thus must we do; the infinitive with *lamed* is used in this sense in chap. v. 1, and ix. 25; it is differently construed in Ex. viii. 22. V. 5. *From Shihor of Egypt ;* according to other passages the southern boundary of Palestine was formed by *Nachal Mizraim*, the river of Egypt (vid. Josh. xv. 4, 47; Num. xxxiv. 5; 1 Kings viii. 65; 2 Kings xxiv. 7; 2 Chr. vii. 8; Is. xxvii. 12), or *Nahar Mizraim* (Gen. xv. 18), probably the brook which falls into the Mediterranean near the modern el-Arish, the ancient Ῥινοκόρουρα; cf. LXX. Is. xxvii. 12. As the expression in Joshua xiii. 3, "Shihor which is before Egypt," is merely another name for this brook, and does not refer to the Nile, and as there was also a small river on the borders of Asher, which bore the name of Shihor Libnath (Josh. xix. 26), we have no hesitation in deciding that *Shihor Mizraim* in the passage before us was also another name for the brook which formed the southern boundary of Palestine, and which is elsewhere designated the *Nachal* Mizraim. In Isaiah xxiii. 3, Jer. ii. 18, the Nile itself is called the *Shihor*, but in the historical books, and, with the exception of these two passages, in the prophetical books also it is called by the ordinary name הַיְאֹר.—On the preservation of the ark in *Kirjath-jearim*, see v. 6.—In what relation does vv. 1—5 stand to 2 Sam. vi. 1, "*then David gathered together again all the men of Israel who were capable of bearing arms, thirty thousand,*" which is rendered by the Septuagint *καὶ συνήγαγεν ἔτι Δαυὶδ πάντα νεανίαν ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἑβδομήκοντα χιλιάδας*? Before answering this question we must justify our rendering of the words. *Thenius* supposes them to mean: *and David increased again all the picked men to about* 30,000, in which case they would have nothing to do with the account of the ark of the covenant, but would merely contain a notice of the addition which David made to his army, and might be regarded as the conclusion of the history of the wars in 2 Sam. v. We see nothing, however, in these words at all resembling a conclusion; on the contrary, they form the commencement of a fresh section, which is linked to the foregoing portion of the narrative by the word *again*. Now וַיֹּסֶף may have the same meaning as וַיֶּאֱסֹף (cf. 1 Sam.

xv. 6; Ps. civ. 29), and this meaning is actually given to it here in the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and the Syriac versions. Moreover *Thenius* is obliged to alter the text in order to arrive at the explanation which he adopts (he inserts a lamed before Sheloshim). Lastly, the second verse presupposes some account of an assembly in the first. Hence the usual interpretation, which is confirmed by the Chronicles, must be retained, viz. *again, David assembled together all the chosen men*, &c. David assembled them *again*, *i.e.*, a second time. The first time, Israel gathered together around David in Hebron, 2 Sam. v. 1, 3; 1 Chr. xii. 23—40; and although the first assembly is not said to have been called together by David, a second assembly could be very properly described as *collected together again by him*, the chief point being the fact of their re-assembling, and the manner in which they were convened being a matter of but little moment. There is certainly something striking in the statement that he gathered together 30,000 men, for according to 1 Chr. xii. 23—40 and other passages, the men of Israel who were capable of bearing arms at the time of David were much more numerous than this. For 30,000 the Septuagint reads 700,000, and no number at all is given in the Chronicles. It might be conjectured that the occurrence of this number led the author of the Chronicles to explain the brief statement in 2 Sam. vi. 1 according to the narrative which follows, and to bring the notice of the holding of an assembly of thirty thousand men into harmony with the fact that all Israel took part in the removal of the ark of the covenant (2 Sam. vi. 5; 1 Chr. xiii. 6, 8). In this case we must suppose that he referred the first statement to an assembly of distinguished warriors and princes, and regarded the second as denoting that the assembly of the whole people was called by them, and that this led him to distinguish the two assemblies, viz. the smaller or preparatory one, and the second or larger assembly of the whole people. Such an explanation as this might be given of the connection between the verses before us and 2 Sam. vi. 1, if there were any necessity for it. But the question suggests itself whether thirty thousand be the correct reading in the latter passage. When we keep clearly before our minds the account given by our historian, and remember that he also speaks of princes of the thousands, and that the number

30,000 does not occur anywhere else in the history of David, we are led to the conclusion that in all probability the original reading of the text of 2 Sam. vi. 1 was, "and David assembled together again all the chosen men of Israel, *the Sheloshim and the princes of the thousands.*" The mention of the Sheloshim, *i.e.*, of the most distinguished warriors and of the princes of the thousands, would necessarily imply that it was a preliminary assembly, and the connection between such an assembly and the general assembly of all the people could hardly be explained in any other way, than it is in the verses before us. In our commentary upon the verses themselves, we shall point out the peculiar phraseology contained in the latest historical books and particularly in the Books of Chronicles, which leads us to conclude that we have here an expansion of the brief accounts contained in 2 Sam. vi. 1.

Vv. 6—14.—V. 6. *And David went up and all Israel to Baalah* (another name for the town of Kirjath Jearim, Josh. xv. 9, which is also called Kirjath Baal, Josh. xviii. 14) away *to Kirjath Jearim, which belongs to Judah* (Judg. xviii. 12). From Josh. xx. 9 we should be led to expect הִיא rather than אֶל between Baalah and Kirjath Jearim; still אֶל is intelligible, as the clause *away to Kirjath Jearim* may be regarded as defining more precisely the expression, *to Baalah.* It would be still more easily accounted for, if we could take Baalah as the name of the district of Kirjath Jearim or of the hill upon which the town was situated (cf. Josh. xv. 11): *to (the district of) Baalah,* (or more exactly) *to Kirjath Jearim.* The ark of the covenant had remained in this place, at the house of Abinadab (1 Sam. vii. 1), since the time when it was delivered up by the Philistines, with the exception of a short period during which it was at Bethshemesh. אשר נקרא שֵׁם *who is called name* (cf. Lev. xxiv. 16, a passage which was evidently present to the minds of the Masoretes when they adopted this punctuation), but such a remark as this, that Jehovah is also called Shem (name), is evidently superfluous, at least in this connection, and as שֵׁם שָׁם is the reading of 2 Sam. vi. 2, שָׁם is clearly the proper reading here: who is worshipped *there* (viz., at the ark of the covenant).

## 2. CHAP. XIV. BUILDING OF DAVID'S HOUSE, &C.

Vv. 1, 2. cf. 2 Sam. v. 11, 12.—The readiness with which the king of the powerful and prosperous city of Tyre complied with the wishes of David, by sending messengers to open up communications, and placing skilful artizans at his service, was one of the most important of the fortunate circumstances connected with David's reign. It is not surprising, therefore, that immediately after the account of his alliance with Hiram, we should find the remark, *then David perceived, how Jehovah had appointed him king over Israel* (xxii. 10).—*His kingdom was lifted up on high.* נִשֵּׂאת, according to the context, must be the third person feminine Niphal, an entirely exceptional form (in 2 Sam. xix. 43 the word occurs with the same pointing as an infinitive absolute Niphal), which, on account of the addition of the *Tav* of the feminine, has received the same pointing as is usually given to feminine participles, נִשָּׂאת becoming first נִשֶּׂאת and then נִשֵּׂאת. לְמַעְלָה very frequently occurs in the Chronicles in connection with a verb which it renders more emphatic (*e.g.*, chap. xxii. 5, xxiii. 17, xxix. 3, 25; 2 Chr. i. 1, xvii. 12); hence we conclude that in this passage it is added by our historian himself. מלכותו for מַמְלַכְתּוֹ, the former is the form usually adopted by the later historians; in the present connection, and in chap. xvii. 11, 14, it has been substituted for the other or earlier form, which we find in 2 Sam. v. 12.

Vv. 3—7. cf. chap. iii. 5—8 and 2 Sam. v. 13—16.—In 2 Sam. iii. 5 concubines are mentioned before the *wives*. There is no reason to suppose that the former were intentionally omitted by the author of the Chronicles, for he refers to the concubines of David in chap. iii. 9.—*In Jerusalem;* this is the correct reading, which must originally have stood in Samuel also, for it is absolutely required there by the clause, *after he had come from Hebron*, which is wanting in the Chronicles, and the statement that the wives *sprang from Jerusalem* does not seem in any way suitable.—V. 4. The list of David's children had already been given at chap. iii. 5—8, but was inserted here again, because it stood in this connection in the original documents employed by our historian.

V. 8—12. cf. 2 Sam. v. 17—21.—*To seek David;* viz., for the purpose of destroying him, cf. 1 Sam. xxiii. 15, 25, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 2.—*He went out to meet them;* in the parallel passage in Samuel we have "*he went down into the fortress*" of Zion, chap. xi. 5. The expression *went down* might be explained on the supposition that David had hitherto continued in the mountains to the south of Zion, from which you look down upon Zion itself, and that the attack of the Philistines was first directed against this position, whereupon David withdrew to Zion; but it is more probable that the expression "to go down" is used in antithesis to the "going up" spoken of in *v.* 10, and merely denotes the act of retiring into a fortress. *Thenius* is of opinion that the use of this expression proves, that the attack referred to was some previous attack of the Philistines, which took place before the conquest of Jerusalem, and that the Mezudah (the fortress) was the cave of Adullam, but in this he completely sets aside the express statement of the verse before us, that David was king over all Israel, when the Philistines made this invasion. For the difficult words, *he went down to the fortress,* the historian has substituted the more general and very intelligible clause, "*he went up to meet them.*"—*In the valley of Rephaim,* vid. chap. xi. 15.—V. 10. *And wilt thou deliver them;* both here and at the end of the verse, where the same word occurs again, we have the perfect with *Vav* conseq., whereas in 2 Sam. v. the imperfect is used in both instances. It is impossible to determine which was the earliest reading; the perfect is very frequently met with in such a connection; *e.g.* in the similar sentence, 2 Kings xxi. 14. —V. 11. The battle was fought at Baal Perazim, and hence the words of our text, "*then* the Philistines *went up on the Baal-Perazim,*" refer to the same fact as those of Samuel, "*then David went to Baal-Perazim.*" The place mentioned, *Baal-Perazim,* is not otherwise known; at the same time it does not appear to have been a different place from the mountain of Perazim, Is. xxviii. 21.—*Peraz Maim, the breaking forth of water;* hence *Perazim* denotes the fissures made by the force of the water, and *Baal-Perazim* may have been the name of a mountain that had been seamed by torrents. According to the passage before us it owed its name to a historical event, namely, to a fierce conflict in which God broke through the enemy by the hand of

David like the *breaking through* of waters.—V. 12. The Philistines fled so quickly, that they left their *idols* upon the battle field, and the latter *were burnt at the command of David.* In 2 Sam. v. it is merely stated that *David and his men carried them away*, but the purpose for which they did so is not mentioned. The law commanded that idols should be burnt (Deut. vii. 5, 25). *Movers* regards the statement respecting the burning as a more precise account from a different source. By this victory David wiped away the reproach which had rested upon the nation from the days of Eli. As the Israelites were then deprived of their ark (1 Sam. iv. 11), so on the other hand did the gods of the Philistines now fall into their hands.

Vv. 13—17. cf. 2 Sam. v. 22—25.—V. 13. *In the valley;* according to 2 Sam. v. it was *the valley of Rephaim* (which is also the reading adopted here by the Septuagint and Syriac). There can be no doubt that this was the valley intended by our historian; *vid. v.* 16. *Movers* (p. 243) supposes that another valley is here referred to, namely, a valley near Gibeon, but *Thenius* has successfully replied to this in his note on 2 Sam. v. 22.—V. 14. "*Go not up after them;*" in 2 Sam. v. we find merely "*Go not up.*" This is a sufficient reply to the question, "Shall I attack them?" which we may supply here from *v.* 10; and if anything further were added we should expect it to be not after them, but *against* them, as an attack is expressly prohibited. The former reading has probably crept in from 2 Sam. v. 23, "fetch a compass behind them," and should therefore be either omitted, or altered into the other. The latter is the better plan of the two. *Turn away from them;* in 2 Sam. v. "*turn round so as to come upon their rear.*" As the latter reading is in harmony with the context, and in all respects suits the passage before us, we cannot but assume that it was the original reading of the text of the Chronicles also. From the *Baca-trees;* they must therefore have stood behind the Philistines. On the Baca-trees see *Winer* Realwörtertuch i. p. 128 (and *Kitto's* Cyclopædia i. p. 276). In the *Septuagint*, *Aquila*, and the *Vulgate*, the word is rendered ἄπιος, pyrus.—V. 15. הצעדה (written in 2 Sam. v. without the article); according to the ordinary interpretation, *the sound of the going of God.* The feminine is only met with in this verse, and the parallel passage

in Samuel. There is no reason to question the correctness of the reading as it is found in both books. But it is not so evident that we are justified in supplying the genitive: "*of God.*" For it must be borne in mind that the sound of the going in the tops of the Baca-trees was merely to be the sign from which David could perceive that God would surely go before him. And this sign, according to the context in both accounts, may have been simply the rustling of the leaves of the Baca-trees, which is described in the Septuaguit as *τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ συσσεισμοῦ αὐτῶν.* The rustling of the leaves, so far as I can see, is called the sound of going on account of its resemblance to the sound produced by walking through fallen leaves (cf. Gen. iii. 8, the sound of God walking in the garden); and if we give this interpretation to the words: a a sound like that produced by walking, there will be no necessity to supply the genitive: "*of God.*" *Ewald* (Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 610) refers to the Arabic, and explains the word as meaning a dull sound as of one breathing with difficulty (cf. דְּמָמָה which occurs in 1 Kings xix. 12 and Job iv. 16, as a sign of the self-revealing Deity.) But why then is it so expressly stated that this sound was to be heard in the tops of the Baca-trees?—V. 16. *And David* (and his people) *smite;* in 2 Sam. v. we find the singular. The engagement was so decisive that the Philistines were compelled to retreat from the whole line of which they had taken possession. This line stretched from *Gibeon* to *Gezer*. *Gibeon*, undoubtedly the present el-Jib, was about six miles from Jerusalem in a north-westerly direction, cf. chap. viii. 29. The situation of Gezer may now be determined with tolerable precision (cf. Judg. i. 29); it must have stood very near to the spot on which it is placed upon the map by *v. Raumer* and *Stülpnagel*, about five miles from Gibeon in a north-westerly direction. But it is *a priori* improbable, that the Philistines, who were attacking David and his army, the base of whose operations was Jerusalem, occupied this line from Gibeon to Gezer. Moreover, it would be difficult to reconcile with such a position the statement contained in 2 Sam. v. 22 that they had spread themselves out in the valley of Rephaim. Now, in 2 Sam. v. 25, instead of Gibeon, we find the very similar name Geba; and if we suppose this Geba to have been the same as

Gibea in the province of Judah (Josh. xv. 57), which we can have no difficulty in recognising in the modern village of Yefa on a conical hill about nine or ten miles to the south-west of Jerusalem (*Robinson* ii. p. 580, 593), we should then have a line given here, which passed near the western slope of the mountains of Judah, and terminated towards the south in Geba or Gibea, a prominent city which could be seen from a great distance, and towards the north in Gezer, a place that was certainly situated upon a very rocky projection of the long hill towards the west, which contains distinct traces of fortifications (*Robinson* iii. p. 211, 272). Now this line suits the context in every respect. From it the Philistines could very easily overspread the valley of Rephaim, and it would form a good point of support for the attacks upon Judah, being intersected by the roads which led from Judah to the cities of the Philistines. To recover possession of this line was equivalent to setting free the whole of the mountains of Judah as far as their most westerly slope, and it is very apparent that our author intended to show that such a deliverance was really effected by the decisive battle here described. We cannot possibly see what obstacle there is to our fixing upon this Gibea in the province of Judah as the place referred to (*Ewald* Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 610), for Gibea or Geba, in the tribe of Benjamin, would not answer to the description contained in the verses before us much better than Gibeon.—V. 17. This verse, which indicates the result of the events just described, is not found in Samuel. We agree with *Movers* (p. 196) that it was appended by the historian himself, as an appropriate conclusion to the parenthetical notices with which he had interrupted his account of the ark of the covenant, for the passage reminds us in several respects of other similar passages in the Books of Chronicles.

3. Chap. xv. and xvi. The thread of the story, which was broken off at chap. xiii. 14, is here resumed. It appears as if the events narrated in chap. xiv. filled up the three months, during which the ark of the covenant remained in the house of Obed Edom; at all events this interval afforded an opportunity for introducing supplementary notices of certain matters connected with the history of David. The commencement of the account of the ark of the covenant in chap. xiii. corresponds in

almost every respect to 2 Sam. vi. 1—11; but the continuation in the chapters before us contains much more elaborate details than the corresponding section in 2 Sam. vi. 11—19, which we find almost word for word in chap. xvi. 25 to xvii. 3. But both before and after this section, viz. in chap. xvi. 1—24, and xvii. 4—43, the Book of Chronicles contains a variety of particulars, to which we find no reference in the Books of Samuel.

V. 1. Among the buildings completed by David was a tent for the ark of God, the construction of which is narrated in the verse before us. This tent is only casually referred to in 2 Sam. vi. 17. *He built himself houses* (besides the house which he had erected with the assistance of Hiram, chap. xiv. 1) *in the city of David*, chap. xi. 5; he also set up a new *tent for the ark of the covenant*. The old tent (tabernacle) was left in Gibeon (chap. xvi. 39, xxi. 29; 1 Kings iii. 4 seq., ix. 2), but our historical books furnish no explanation of the reason why the ancient holy tabernacle was not removed from Gibeon to Jerusalem.

Vv. 2—24. The assembled Israelites proceeded from Jerusalem to the place where the ark of the covenant then was. The preparations for the solemn procession, which was to accompany the ark to Jerusalem, are fully described. V. 2. The word *then* refers to the time already mentioned in chap. xiii. 14, viz. at the end of the three months. The fact that the ark was carried is briefly recorded in 2 Sam. vi. 13, but in the passage before us it is emphatically stated that it was the vocation of the Levites to carry it (Num. i. 50, iv. 15, vii. 9, x. 17), and this declaration contains an express acknowledgment that it was illegal to place it on a cart (chap. xiii. 7).—V. 3. The attendance of all Israel to take part in the procession is noticed in Samuel also, but it is only here that we read that David had "gathered all Israel together to Jerusalem" for that purpose (cf. chap. xiii. 5, and xxviii. 1.)—V. 4. The heads of the tribe of the Levites (v. 12) together with their brethren were set apart from the rest of the assembled Israelites as a sacred band. *The sons of Aaron* were the priests named in *v.* 11; *the Levites* were the six princes with their brethren, vv. 5—10.—V. 5. *Of the sons of Kohath, Uriel* (chap. vi. 9) *the prince* with 120 of his family; he is mentioned first because the Kohathites were specially entrusted with the charge of the sanctuary (Num. vii. 9).—V. 8. *Elizaphan* was a descend-

ant of Kohath; see Ex. vi. 22, where his name is spelt Elzaphan. The prince of the fathers' house (v. 12) of Elizaphan was *Shemaiah*, whose name occurs again in chap. xxiv. 6.—V. 9. *Hebron* a son of Kohath, Ex. vi. 18; 1 Ch. v. 28.—V. 10. *Uzziel* (according to chap. v. 28; Ex. vi. 18, likewise a son of Kohath) was the father of Elzaphan and other sons (Ex. vi. 22). The latter must therefore have formed a father's house of their own, by the side of that of Elzaphan, and given it the name of Uzziel, cf. 1 Ch. xxiii. 20, xxiv. 24. Hence of the six fathers' houses, referred to here, four descended from Kohath, and one each from Merari and Gershom.—V. 11. *Zadok* (who came to Hebron to join David, chap. xii. 28) of the family of Eleazar, and *Abiathar* of that of Ithamar, were the princes of the two priestly lines, and were colleagues in office (chap. xxiv. 3—6; cf. 2 Sam. xv. 24 sqq. xx. 25). They were summoned by David together with the six princes already named, and—v. 12, these, *the heads of the fathers' houses* (chap. viii. 6, 10) were instructed to prepare themselves and their brethren for the sacred duties, which they would have to perform in connexion with the removal of the ark of the covenant. *To sanctify themselves*, *i.e.*, to put away everything unclean, and to avoid coming into contact with anything unclean (Gen. xxxv. 2), for example, putting on unclean clothes (Ex. xix. 10, 15; cf. 2 Ch. xxx. 3.) *Unto that which I have prepared for it;* that is, unto the spot where, according to v. 3, I have prepared a place for it. The omission of the pronoun אשר gives to the relative clause the character of a substantive notion, and this renders it capable of government by a preposition. We find the same construction in 2 Chr. i. 4, and similar ones in 1 Chr. xxix. 3, 2 Chr. xvi. 9, xxx. 18 seq., and Nehem. viii. 10, cf. *Ewald* Lehrbuch 323 b.—V. 13. למבראשונה a compound word; the interrogative *mah* is here connected with a long word, in the same manner as we frequently find it combined with a shorter one, *e.g.* מַזֶּה Ex. iv. 2, מַלָּכֶם Is. iii. 15, cf. מתלאה for מה־תלאה Mal. i. 13. The preposition *lamed* before *mah*, as in לָמָּה *wherefore*, can only appear in the abbreviated form לְ when prefixed to so long a word. The question is this: *why were ye not there at the beginning* (*i.e.* when the ark was taken away from the house of Abinadab, chap. xiii.)? By

כִּי this interrogative clause is made into a conditional protasis; "*for why were ye not there*" &c. means because ye were not there in the beginning, did not God break in upon us with violence? *For we have not sought him*, we have not approached *in the proper way i.e.* according to the law, which required that the sanctuary upon which he was enthroned should be carried by the Levites (Num. vii. 9) and that nothing unclean or unholy should come near to it. דרש to approach is used here in its primary sense, from which that of asking was a derivative (1 Chr. x. 14). —Vv. 14, 15. The Levites came at the summons of David, purified themselves, and, as the historian here relates, in anticipation of the course of events, carried the ark of the covenant. *On their shoulders*, Num. vii. 9.—Vv. 16—24. The princes of the Levites receive instructions to train the musicians and singers, who were subordinate to them, for the solemn procession. They comply with these instructions.—V. 16. The כְּלֵי שִׁיר (Nehem. xii. 36) are the various instruments mentioned here, especially the *nebalim* and *chinneroth*, as we may clearly see from v. 19, and 2 Ch. v. 13. As the Hiphil השמיע has the meaning *to sound* or *cause to clang*, the participle here used may be referred to the musical instruments, *sounding so as to raise a noise, i.e.* so that the singing and music were very loud. In other passages we find the expression to *lift up the voice*; in 2 Chr. v. 13 it refers to the loud blast of trumpets, in Ezra iii. 12 to a loud and joyful shout; and the passage before us *(with the voice)* has a similar meaning to 2 Chr. v. 13. The verb הרים occurs in other passages with the accusative and with *beth*, cf. Ex. xiv. 16, and vii. 20. *For joy*, as a sign of joy, and a means of increasing it, v. 25; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18, xxix. 30.—V. 18. And with them their brethren of *the second rank*; הַמִּשְׁנֶה in the singular occurs also in 2 Kings xxiii. 4; we more frequently find מִשְׁנֵהוּ used to denote the second in a series (1 Sam. vii. 2, xvii. 13; 2 Sam. iii. 3) or in office (1 Chr. xvi. 5. cf. Esther x. 3). The word *Ben*, after Zechariah, has found its way into the text through a copyist's error, as the *Vav* before the following name, and vv. 20 and 25 clearly show. *Jaaziel* is called Aziel in v. 20, and Jeiel in chap. xvi. 5. There are thirteen names in all. The last two Obed-edom and Jeiel (or Jehiah as he is called

in *v.* 24) are described as doorkeepers; but according to *v.* 20 they were employed as musicians.—V. 19—21. The singers mentioned in *v.* 17 seq. were divided into three companies, according to the different instruments on which they played. (1) *v.* 19. *Heman*, *Asaph*, and *Ethan* played *with cymbals* (the word used here only occurs in the Books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, but in these we find it very frequently) *of brass*, cf. *Josephus*, Arch. vii. 12, 3, κύμβαλά τε ἦν πλατέα καὶ μεγάλα χάλκεα. נחשת may be connected with the previous word as an accusative defining it more precisely, since it describes the material of which the instruments were made.—(2) *v.* 20. Zechariah and seven others play בנבלים על עלמות; we are not in a position to explain these words, as our acquaintance with the music of the ancient Israelites does not furnish the least clue to the meaning of the musical terms, which we meet with both in the superscriptions to the Psalms, and also in the body of them in Habakkuk iii., and here and there in the Books of Chronicles. Modern investigations into the music of the ancient Greeks appear to confirm the opinion that the words *Alamoth* and *Hassheminith*, which occur in the superscriptions, and *Al-taschith* (Ps. lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv.), *al Aijeleth hasshachar* (Ps. xxii.) and others which belong to the same category, are names for different tunes. In most of the expressions we can recognise the opening words of songs; the words *Sheminith* (Ps. vi. xii.), and *Gittith* (Ps. viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv.) alone appear to be borrowed from instruments. The word *Alamoth* both here and Ps. xlvi. is pointed by the Masoretes as the plural of Almah *a virgin*. But as we fancy that the same word occurs in the combination *Al muth labben* in the heading of Ps. ix. (the preposition על being probably omitted to avoid the repetition of the same sound *al*) another explanation of the word suggests itself to our mind. At any rate the word עֲלָמוּת the abstract in וּת from עלם in combination with לַבֵּן would give the meaning: *Youth is to the son*, which might very appropriately form the commencement of a song. We shall not offer any further arguments in support of our interpretation of this word, since this could only be done in a treatise embracing all the musical terms that occur in the Old Testament.—(3) *v.* 21. The six here named played *upon lyres after the Sheminith to lead*, probably to

lead the singing by way of accompaniment. What the Sheminith originally signified we cannot tell, for the word, which means *the eighth*, may relate to very different things. It might denote, for example, the eighth in the series of tunes, or an instrument with eight strings, from which the tune received its name, and in this case there would be nothing to hinder the conclusion that the tune was played upon viols which, according to *Josephus* (Antiquities vii. 12, 3), were ten-stringed instruments played with the bow. The Piel נִצֵּחַ means *to lead* according to the evident usage of the language, and this meaning is confirmed by the Aramaean. Of the six names given here only five occur in *v.* 18. The last name in the series is here mentioned first, whether it was omitted from *v.* 18 by mistake, or was inserted in the text in this verse through an oversight, we cannot tell. The three classes of singers had thus three different instruments to play, cymbals, nablia, and lyres (citharae.) The first served to produce a loud *clang*, the last *led*. No tune is mentioned in the case of the first, probably because their clear tones were only introduced at intervals, the other two were played to certain tunes.

Vv. 22—24. The historian avails himself of the opportunity to give the names of other Levites and priests who took part in the solemn procession. V. 22. *Chenaniah* (*v.* 27, chap. xxvi. 29) *the prince of the Levites* was not one of the six princes (vv. 5—10). They were princes of the Levitical families, but according to this verse Chenaniah was properly a prince on account of his office, which required peculiar learning; he was therefore necessarily appointed without regard to his family and birth. He was בְּמַשָּׂא and, as is afterwards added by way of explanation, יסר במשא; the inf. abs. Kal יָסֹר, which only occurs here, means *to admonish*, according to the use of the Kal in Prov. ix. 7; Ps. xciv. 10; Hos. x. 10, but as it is a skilful man who is here entrusted with this duty, most commentators have felt no hesitation in taking the word admonish in the sense of *teach, instruct* (*e.g. J. H. Michaelis, Gesenius thes.* p. 918). In that case the infinitive absolute in the explanatory clause takes the place of a finite tense: *he gives instruction in anything.* Others regard the word as an imperfect of the root סָרַר = שָׂרַר, *he was*

*a prince.* בַּמַּשָּׂא (this is the proper punctuation) in most editions is written the first time with, the second time without the article; *R. Norzi*, however, expressly states that the proper punctuation in both instances is with the article. The *Septuagint* renders it *ἄρχων τῶν ᾠδῶν; Luther* translates it *der Sangmeister* (the singing-master), and the majority of commentators adopt this rendering, but others follow the *Vulgate (prophetiæ præerat ad præcinendam melodiam)*, and, taking the word to be a term associated with prophecy, make Chenaniah a leader or prince of *prophecy*. Others again suppose him to have been a president and leader of the Levites appointed to carry the sacred things, and appeal to the use of the word in 2 Chr. xxxv. 3; Num. iv. 19, 27, 31, 32, 47 *(e.g., Junius, Tremellius)*. The following then are the interpretations given of this verse: *the prince of the Levites over the singing* (the prophecy, or the carrying), *he gave instruction in singing* (prophesying, or carrying), or he *was superintendent of the singing* (prophesying, or carrying). It is hard to say which of these is to be preferred, for the Old Testament furnishes but few data for the explanation of this brief passage. But from the few we possess, we conclude, for the following reasons, that the word means *to carry*,—(1) As the whole section treats of the transport of the ark, those passages are peculiarly in point in which the word is used to denote the carrying of the ark, or of the sacred things in general. Now, according to 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, after the building of the temple there was no *Massah* (burden) upon the shoulders of the Levites, *i.e.*, when once the Israelites possessed a temple in the place of the moveable sanctuary, they no longer required to make provision for the carrying of the sacred things. The same word is also applied in Num. iv. 19 sqq. to the carriage of the holy things. (2.) It would be very strange if Chenaniah were described as the leader of the sacred singing (as he is in the *Septuagint* version), seeing that Heman, Asaph, and Ethan are spoken of as the leaders of the singing and the music, not only in the chapter before us but in many passages besides, and Chenaniah is never mentioned in connection with them. It is evident that the only reason why the LXX. referred the word in this instance to the lifting up of the voice in singing was, that music had formed the subject of the previous verses,

and that *the singers* are afterwards mentioned (in *v.* 27) along with *Hammassa.* (3.) Chenaniah is described in chap. xxvi. 29 as the superintendent of *the* Levites, who had to attend to *outward affairs,* and were employed *as overseers and judges.* Now the Levites, who were scribes and overseers (2 Chr. xxxiv. 13; 1 Chr. xxiv. 5), were distinct from the singers, and hence, supposing the Chenaniah there spoken of to be the same man, we cannot possibly imagine him to have been a leader of the singers. But it is a very conceivable thing that when the sanctuary had been placed in a permanent building, the overseers and judges might be selected from among *the* Levites, who had previously been appointed to carry the holy things (cf. 2 Chr. xxxv. 3 sqq.). We should then take יסר as the imperfect of סר = שׂר. But we are hardly justified in giving to the Kal the meaning to teach, or instruct; and should not expect to find the infinitive absolute in this passage. Hence, even without any further reference to the connection, we feel perfectly warranted in giving the preference to this explanation, which is clearly admissible, especially when we consider the frequent interchange of *samech* and *sin.* Moreover, not a few MSS. and one edition of the Bible have the reading יָשֹׂר or יָשׂוֹר.—*For he was clever,* and well-fitted on account of his knowledge for the discharge of the duties of his office. מֵבִין generally denotes a knowledge of music (chap. xxv. 7; 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12), but it is also used in a different sense when applied to Levites in 2 Chr. xxxv. 3, and to other men of skill in 1 Chr. xxvi. 5. The rendering which we propose is this: *and Chenaniah, the prince of the Levites over the burden* (the preposition *beth* may be easily explained from the notion of ruling or leading contained in the substantive *Sar) he led the burden, for he was skilled,* sc. in the customs which it was necessary to observe in the carriage of the holy things.—V. 23. *Berechiah and Elkanah were doorkeepers of the ark,* as well as Obed-edom and Jëiel (vv. 18, 24); they probably went immediately before the ark with their attendants, whilst the latter with their attendants brought up the rear.—V. 24. *Nethaneel* apparently the father of Shemaiah; chap. xxiv. 6.—*Benaiah* vid. chap. xvi. 6.—The order of the procession was as follows: (1), the singers in three companies, vv. 19—21; (2), Chenaniah the

prince of the Levites, v. 22; (3), two doorkeepers (with their attendants), v. 23; (4), the priests with trumpets immediately before the ark; lastly (5), two doorkeepers (with their attendants), v. 24.

V. 25 to chap. xvi. 3 (cf. 2 Sam. vi. 12—19).—V. 25. The corresponding words in 2 Sam. vi. 12 are these: *then David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom into the city of David with gladness.* Instead of David alone, the elders of Israel and the princes of the thousands are mentioned here in accordance with v. 3 and chap. xiii. 1; and instead of the *ark of God* it is called the *ark of the covenant of Jehovah* as in vv. 26, 28, 29. The narrative, which proceeds without interruption in Samuel, is here continued after the long parenthesis, and the connection is loosely established by the word ויהי; thus also for the clause "and he went . . . with joy," there was necessarily substituted the longer clause, "*it was David and the elders of Israel . . . who went . . . with gladness.*" —V. 26. The account given in this verse differs from that contained in 2 Sam. vi. According to the verse before us, the sacrifices were offered because God helped the Levites, who carried the ark of the covenant, *i.e.*, because God had permitted them to continue near his sanctuary, and even to carry it upon their shoulders, without their suffering the same fate as Uzza (chap. xiii. 10); and the meaning evidently is, that immediately after the ark had been lifted up "*they offered seven oxen and seven rams.*" But, according to 2 Sam. vi., after the ark had moved six paces forward, David offered an ox and a fatling, for there is no reason to interpret the words as meaning that an ox and a fattened calf were sacrificed every six paces (the Septuagint clearly reads seven), although this is the explanation which most commentators give to the passage. The difference between the two accounts is therefore not very great, and both of them may be founded upon the same original record, as they both treat of sacrifices, which were offered immediately after the lifting of the ark or after it had moved seven paces forwards, and the number seven occurs in the Book of Chronicles as the number of animals sacrificed.

(*Keil* does not adopt the same method of reconciling the two accounts. He says: "the two passages relate to different sacri-

fices, as *Grotius*, *Clericus*, and others have already observed. According to 2 Sam. vi. 13 an ox and a fatted sheep were offered during the procession, when the bearers of the ark had moved six paces forward; on the other hand, according to 1 Chr. xv. 26, the Levites offered seven bullocks and seven rams after the ark had been safely brought to the place intended for it, that is, after the procession was over, as it is expressly stated that 'God had *helped* the Levites who bore the ark.' Hence the two accounts do not exclude each other, but are supplementary the one to the other. We need not be amazed at the great number of animals slain, for, according to 2 Sam. vi. 19, a feast was given from these sacrifices to the whole of the people, who had assembled in great crowds. Nor can any objection to 2 Sam. vi. 13 be founded upon the fact that the procession would have been interrupted too much by the offering of sacrifices every six paces, for it is not said that the bearers always stood still while the sacrifices were offered. And it is most probable that priests were stationed at regular intervals throughout the entire distance who offered sacrifices when the ark passed by, without interfering with the advance of the procession itself.")

V. 27. מעיל the upper garment worn by the higher classes over the *Cuttoneth* (2 Sam. xiii. 18)—השר המשא המשוררים has been supposed to mean *the prince* (and supplying a second שַׂר) *namely the prince of the Massa and the singers*, so that *vav* would have to be supplied before the last word, or שַׂר supplied a second time with the meaning: *namely the prince of the singers*. But it is evident that such additions to the text are inadmissible. We conjecture rather that there is an error in the text, although the translators of the earliest versions had the text before them in its present form, for the *Septuagint* reads, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ᾠδῶν τῶν ᾀδόντων, the *Vulgate*, *princeps prophetiae inter cantores*, and the *Syriac* alone contains no trace of these words. In 2 Sam. vi. instead of the clause from "*and David*" to "*the Massa* (with) *the singers*" we find the words *and David danced with all his might before Jehovah*, and a copyist remembering the reference already made in the verse to David's dress might easily write מכרבל for מכרכר, and from the illegibility of the original set down במעיל בוץ for בכל עז as a conjectural reading. The fact that the bearers of the ark, the singers and Chenaniah are mentioned

along with David may easily be explained from the previous verses. But *hammassa* has most probably crept into the text from v. 22, and "*the singers*" through an unintentional repetition. At any rate the text is not of such a nature that the juxtaposition of *hammassa* and "*the singers*" can warrant us in inferring that the obscure word *hammassa* was used to denote "*the singers.*" The concluding words "*and David wore a linen shoulder-garment*" (the dress of the priests, 1 Sam. xxii. 18) occur in almost exactly the same form in 2 Sam. vi. Earlier expositors have assumed, as the simplest explanation of the verse before us, that David wore a linen shoulder-garment (a cape or shawl) over the dress of byssus. *Movers* is of opinion that the historian had two accounts before him, the one of which represented David as accompanying the procession clothed in a dress of byssus, while the other merely mentioned the shoulder-garment of linen, and that he adopted both accounts. We cannot subscribe to such opinions, since the Hebrew of the words "clothed with a robe of byssus" so closely resembles that of the expression "danced with all his might" (2 Sam. vi.), as to indicate not different accounts, but the same original text. V. 28. Given with greater brevity in 2 Sam. vi. 15. The fuller details in the verse before us refer back to vv. 19—21. *With cymbals sounding loudly;* the words are separated by the accents, but according to v. 19 and chap. xvi. 5, they are evidently connected together. V. 29. Instead of *dancing and playing,* the reading in Samuel is leaping and dancing. It is worthy of notice that the historian in mentioning Michal, evidently refers to the account contained in 2 Sam. vi. 20—23, though he omits the incident there narrated (see chap. xvi. 43).—Chap. xvi. 1 (cf. xv. 1). The points in which this verse and the following differ from 2 Sam. vi. 17—18 are very unimportant.—אשׁפר does not occur anywhere else except in 2 Sam. vi. It is not easy to determine with certainty the meaning of the word (cf. *Thenius*); the *Vulgate* renders the passage *et partem assae carnis bubalae,* and the Rabbins also understand the word as meaning *a portion of meat.*

After the word אשׁישׁה there follows a further description of the festivities and of the order of worship to be performed at the temple in Jerusalem. This description extends from v. 4 to 43. It is only found in the Book of Chronicles, and looks like a long

parenthesis when compared with the text of the Book of Samuel; for it separates the word *Ashisha* (rendered *flagon* in the English version, *a cake* by Gesenius—Tr.) from the clause which immediately follows it in 2 Sam. vi. 19: "*so all the people departed every one to his house, and David returned to bless his household,*" and we find this clause with but little variation in verse 43 at the close of the narrative.

Chap. xvi. 4—36. Vv. 4—6. When the ark of the covenant had been placed in its tent, the Levites entered upon their duties before the ark, according to David's instructions.—V. 4. לְהַזְכִּיר; compare the superscription to the two psalms xxxviii. and lxx., where the same word occurs. V. 5. *Jeiel* is called *Jaaziel* in chap. xv. 18, and *Aziel* in chap. xv. 20. The form in which it is written here may probably be explained, by supposing that the eye of the copyist wandered to the name *Jehiel*, which occurs immediately afterwards. In chap. xv. 19—21 we have a list of the men who accompanied the ark to Jerusalem, but in the verses before us we have merely the names of those who were appointed to serve before the ark. There is nothing surprising, therefore, in the fact that only a portion of those previously named are mentioned here.—V. 6. *Benaiah* was one of the priests spoken of in chap. xv. 24, but *Jahaziel* is not noticed there.—Vv. 7—36. By David's directions Asaph and his brethren joined in singing a psalm of praise, which is given here.—V. 7. *On that day David committed first to Asaph and his brethren to thank Jehovah.* The words נָתַן בְּיַד are separated from each other by several intervening words, but they must be taken together and explained in the usual way, viz., *to commit to* any one, since the express intention of v. 4 is to lay stress upon the fact, that Asaph entered for the first time upon the duties assigned him on the very day, on which the ark was brought to Jerusalem.—*First;* because the order of worship appointed by David was then observed for the first time. —The psalm contained in vv. 8—36 consists of Ps. cv. 1—15, xcvi., cvii. 1, and cvi. 47, 48. On the relation of the psalm before us to the corresponding passages in the Book of Psalms, we shall be better able to speak after noticing the points in which they differ.—Verses 8—11 are found in Ps. cv. 1—4 in precisely the same form as here.—V. 12. פִּיהוּ for פִּיו Ps. cv. 5.—V. 13. *The seed of Israel;* Ps. cv. 6, *the seed of Abraham.* The read-

ing in the Chronicles is the better of the two on account of the parallelism.—V. 15. *Be ye mindful;* Ps. cv. 8, *he hath remembered,* the latter is preferable because of the perfect which follows "*he hath commanded.*"—ליצחק; the softer form occurs in Ps. cv. 9 לישחק, which we also meet with in Jerem. xxxiii. 26 and Amos vii. 9.—V. 18. ארץ; Ps. cv. 11, את-ארץ.—V. 19. *when ye were;* Ps. cv. 12, *when they were.* The third person suffix may easily have been altered into the second on account of the occurrence of the second in v. 18.—V. 20. *And from one kingdom;* the *vav* is omitted in Ps. cv.—V. 21. For איש we find אדם in Ps. cv.—V. 22. *Do my prophets no harm;* in Ps. cv. we have *lamed* instead of *beth.*—V. 23. The two clauses of this verse are found in Ps. xcvi. 1, 2, with two others which are not given here. *From day to day;* the psalm has *lamed* instead of *el.*—V. 24. את-כבודו; without את in Ps. xcvi. 3.—V. 25. *He also is to be feared;* the *vav* is omitted in the psalm.—V. 27. *Strength and gladness are in his place;* Ps. xcvi. 6, "*strength and beauty are in his sanctuary.*" The word חדוה (gladness) which is very common in Aramaean, only occurs twice in the Old Testament, here and Nehem. viii. 10.—V. 29. "*come before him;*" Ps. xcvi. 8, "*come into his courts.*" The three clauses in this verse are very remarkable, as we find but two any where else. In Ps. xcvi. 9, the two clauses 29 (*c*) and 30 (*a*) form one verse. The symmetry of the verses has been destroyed by the omission of the first clause of Ps. xcvi. 10, after verse 31 (*a*). In consequence of this omission there were only five clauses left, and these have been arranged in two verses. The missing clause is afterwards given in v. 31 (*b*).—V. 30. In Ps. xcvi. 10, the words "*that it be not moved*" are followed by the clause "*he shall judge the people righteously;*" a clause taken from Ps. ix. 9 and xcviii. 9.—V. 31 (*b*) we find in Ps. xcvi. 10 (*a*). The introduction of this clause occasions another change in the division of the verses, and a separation of the coordinate members.—V. 32. השדה; Ps. xcvi. 12, שָׂדַי the old form of the word which gained currency again in a later age.—V. 33. *The trees of the wood,* Ps. xcvi. *all the trees of the wood. Before the Lord;* the *mem* is omitted in the psalm. The second clause corresponds to the first of Ps. xcvi. 13; the conclusion of the psalm (xcvi. 13 *b*)

is omitted here.—V. 34 occurs in Ps. cvi. 1 and cvii. 1.—V. 35—36 we find with very few variations in Ps. cvi. 47, 48, where v. 36 forms the doxology at the close of the fourth book of the Psalms; but it is worthy of notice that instead of "*let all the people say Amen; praise ye Jehovah*," which we find in Ps. cvi. 48, the words as they stand here are, "*and all the people said Amen, and praised Jehovah.*" In this case they form part of the narrative and describe the manner in which the liturgical ceremony terminated: *then* (at the conclusion of the singing) *all the people said Amen and praised Jehovah.* The infinitive הַלֵּל is to be regarded as a continuation of the previous imperative with *vav conseq.*

We have thus collected together the points in which our text differs from the Psalms, for the purpose of obtaining the means of replying to the question, what is the connection between the psalm before us and the corresponding passages in the Book of Psalms, and between the text of the former and that of the latter?

The first thing which attracts our attention is the manner in which the different sections of the psalm given here are found scattered about in the Book of Psalms.—Vv. 8—22 form the commencement of Ps. cv.; and this psalm is so constructed that verses 10—15, relating to the history of Abraham, naturally require, as a continuation, the history of Jacob and of the Israelites in Egypt to the time of Moses, which is given in v. 16 sqq. The construction of the psalm is as follows: Israel is called upon to praise God and remember the wonderful works of God (vv. 1—7), who has always been mindful of the covenant which he made with Abraham (vv. 8, 9). The historical proof, that he has been mindful of this covenant, is given in v. 10 and the following verses in a continuous and harmonious description of the incidents connected with the early history of the nation. Thus v. 16 is closely connected with v. 15, and it is at once apparent that v. 15 is not the conclusion of the psalm. Hence the psalm, as we have it here, merely gives us in vv. 16—22 the commencement of the historical proof, and then suddenly passes to the words in praise of Jehovah, which we find in Ps. xcvi. This psalm is quoted entire in vv. 23—33, with the exception of the variations noticed above. The powerful and spirited commencement of Ps. xcvi.

1, 2, is softened down by the omission of two clauses, as it no longer forms the commencement here; and the last clause of the 13th verse, which forms so fitting a conclusion to Ps. xcvi., is also omitted here, as the psalm does not end at v. 33. Finally, there are appended a few more verses, containing a fresh exhortation to thank God and seek his aid. Of these, vv. 35, 36 occur at the end of a psalm (cvi.), and this psalm commences with v. 34. The historical notice, which is placed in the Chronicles at the conclusion of the psalm, we find in Ps. cvi. 48; but, as we have already observed, instead of "and the people said," the reading there is "let the people say."—*Hitzig* (Psalmen 2, p. 159 sqq.) endeavours to prove that the psalm before us is to be regarded as the original not only of Ps. cv., but also of Ps. xcvi., and that Ps. cxvi. 1, 47, 48, were taken from this psalm. But although the relation of v. 36 to Ps. cvi. 48 appears to favour this view, we cannot regard it as the correct one. For it appears to us indisputable that the commencement of the historical proof of the proposition, that God was mindful of his covenant, which we have in vv. 16—22, was originally intended to be carried out in the manner, in which we actually find it continued in Ps. cv. 16—45. And if verses 8—22 are evidently merely a portion of a longer psalm, detached from the rest, we are forced to the conclusion that the whole psalm is a collection of such portions of existing psalms, which were here combined together for a particular purpose. Hence, at the very outset, the supposition that we have here a psalm, composed of extracts from psalms which were well known to the Israelites, appears to us more probable than the opinion, that "the author of the Chronicles, with great care, and having recourse to foreign aid, produced a psalm, adapted for an age that was long gone by" (*Hitzig* p. 160). And with regard to the relation between v. 36 and Ps. cvi. 48, we must bear in mind that the fourth book of psalms ends with Ps. cvi., and that v. 48, which no doubt originally formed part of the psalm itself, is also the doxology with which the fourth book concludes; and if in Ps. lxxii. the author of the doxology utters the Amen himself, whereas in Ps. cvi. 48 the people are exhorted to say Amen, this may arise from the fact that the latter psalm originally concluded with the injunction to say Amen. But, in our account of the festival, it was necessary

to relate that the people obeyed this injuuction on the occasion referred to, and therefore the words "let them praise" were altered into "and they praised."

If now we examine into the relation, in which the text of the Chronicles stands to that of the corresponding passages in the psalms, we must state at the outset that the points, in which the one text differs from the other, are nowhere of any great importance, and that they are not such as to justify us in affirming, that we have the original in one case and a mere imitation in the other. We do not dispute that in the passages cited by *Hitzig* (p. 159) the text of the Chronicles contains almost always the earlier and original reading. But there are other passages, in which the reading of the Psalms is undoubtedly to be preferred; *e.g.*, in Ps. cv. 8 זכר is the correct reading, for God was to be praised for having remembered the promises, which were given when the covenant was concluded, and the word, which he established for future generations, *i.e.*, his own promise. Moreover, חדוה (1 Chr. xvi. 27) is a more rare, but certainly not an older word than תפארת in the psalm. Again, as the text of the Psalms was in particular use for liturgical purposes, it was more exposed to alterations on account of changes in the language than the text of a historical book, and for that reason the occurrence of more antiquated phrases and expressions in the Chronicles would not of itself constitute a proof, that the Chronicles contained the original reading and the Psalms were an imitation.

Vv. 37—43. The narrative now goes back to v. 4 sqq., and continues the list of the Levites appointed to serve before the ark, of which we had only the commencement there.—V. 37. *Asaph and his brethren;* we have here the prep. *lamed* before the accusative of the object. *According to the day's duties each on its own day; i.e.*, to perform every day the service that was prescribed for it, cf. 2 Chr. viii. 14, xxxi. 16; Ex. v. 13, 19, xvi. 4.—V. 38. *And their brethren*; the plural suffix shows that some name has been omitted after *Obed-edom*. From the concluding part of the verse it is evident that *Chosah* should be inserted: "*and Obed-edom and Chosah* (chap. xxvi. 10) *and their brethren are sixty-eight; and* (David appointed) *Obed-edom, Ben-Jeduthun and Chosah as doorkeepers;* a larger number of doorkeepers are named in the more complete list given in chap. xxvi.

—Vv. 39, 40. Whilst the ark was kept in the tent that David had prepared for it in Jerusalem, and singers and doorkeepers were appointed to serve there, *Zadok the high priest* and the priests under him continued to discharge the duties of their office before the holy tabernacle, the ancient dwelling place of Jehovah which stood upon the high place at Gibeon, that they might offer upon the altar of burnt-offering the sacrifices commanded. *And Zadok;* the accusative is governed by the verb "*he left,*" which must be supplied from v. 37. *Continually morning and evening;* according to the requirements of the law, Ex. xxix. 38. Num. xxviii. 3, 6. *And* (to offer the other burnt-offerings) *according to all that is written in the law of Moses.* Besides the *continual offering,* the daily sacrifice, the law required other burnt-offerings on the Sabbath, the feast days, &c., (see the law for the offerings at the feasts in Num. xxviii. seq.). Thus in the time of David the worship was performed at two places, where the sacred things, that had been handed down from the age of Moses, were preserved. The ark of the covenant was deposited in Jerusalem, and there Asaph and his brethren served before it as singers, Obed-edom and Chozah acted as door-keepers, and the priests named in v. 6 were simply employed in blowing the trumpets. The holy tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering stood in Gibeon, and there Heman and Jeduthun served as singers, the sons of Jeduthun as door-keepers, and Zadok and his brethren as priests, to offer the sacrifices there according to the law. This serves to explain the reason that Solomon offered the thousand burnt-offerings in Gibeon (1 Kings iii. 4). David, however, did not visit the sanctuary in Gibeon, as we learn from 1 Chr. xxi. 28, xxii. 1, but offered burnt-offerings upon the altar, which he had built in Jerusalem (xxi. 26, 30). The circumstances that led to the continuance of the worship at Gibeon, which consisted chiefly of the offering of sacrifices upon the altar of burnt-offering, we have no means of determining. Solomon appears to have been the first, who fully recognised the rights of Zadok and of the altar under his care, for he made Zadok high-priest (1 Kings ii. 27, 35); he also succeeded in bringing the altar of burnt-offering and the other holy things to Jerusalem (1 Kings viii. 4), and it was only because the old altar was too small, that the new one in the forecourt of the

temple was put in its place 2 Chr. iv. 1.—V. 41. *And with them* (viz., with Zadok and his sons) *were Heman and Jeduthun, and the rest of the chosen ones, who were appointed by name,* (chap. xii. 31) *to give thanks to Jehovah that His mercy is everlasting;* Heman and Jeduthun, and the singers under them, whose names are not given here though they are mentioned elsewhere and probably were given in the original record in this connection also, performed at the high place in Gibeon the same duties, as were entrusted to Asaph at the ark in Jerusalem (see vv. 5, 37). The names of those who were associated with Asaph are given in v. 5. Our historian probably attached greater importance to them, than to those who were stationed in Gibeon.—V. 42. If the text is correct here, the verse must be explained according to v. 5 somewhat as follows: *and with them* (viz. with the singers whose names are not given here) were Heman and Jeduthun (appointed) *as those who sounded the trumpets and cymbals, and the instruments of the song of God.* There is nothing to surprise us in the fact that Heman and Jeduthun are named twice (here and in v. 41), for Asaph is also mentioned twice in v. 5 in precisely the same way; but v. 5 leads us to conjecture that the reading of the original text was a follows: וְהֵימָן וִידוּתוּן בַּחֲצֹצְרוֹת וּבִמְצִלְתַּיִם מַשְׁמִיעִים וְעִמָּהֶם שְׁאָר הַבְּרוּרִים בִּכְלֵי שִׁיר הָאֱלֹהִים (and Heman and Jeduthun, with viols and nablia, and with them the rest of the chosen ones with the instruments of the song of God) for in *v.* 5 those who sounded the viols and nablia, which are probably the instruments here described as the instruments of the song of God, are contrasted with Asaph, who sounded the cymbals. This contrast is not expressed in any way in our present text, and there is sufficient to excite doubts as to its correctness in the fact, that its opening words are merely a repetition of the commencement of the previous verse, that the *lamed* stands before the participle משמיעים (see on the other hand vv. 15, 16, 28, and chap. xvi. 6), and that the preposition *beth* is omitted before the trumpets, cymbals and instruments, whereas it is not omitted in any other instance (*e.g.* xv. 16, 19, 24, 28, xvi. 5). The rendering of this passage in the Septuagint is καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν σάλπιγγες καὶ κύμβαλα τοῦ ἀναφωνεῖν (לְהַשְׁמִיעַ) καὶ ὄργανα τῶν ᾠδῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, but it is not

easy to decide whether the translators had a different text before them, or whether they gave a free translation of the text, as we have it now, for the purpose of putting some kind of meaning into it. The *Vulgate* appears to contain a rendering of our text, but the translators have not succeeded in keeping closely to the original.—*For the door; i.e.* the sons of Jeduthun were door-keepers. Obed-edom, who was a doorkeeper to the ark of the covenant, was also a son of Jeduthun according to v. 38. We must therefore conclude that members of the same family were appointed as doorkeepers both at the ark and at the holy tabernacle in Gibeon.—V. 43 cf. 2 Sam. vi. 19 seq. *To bless his house* on this solemn feast day, as he had already pronounced a blessing on his people in the name of Jehovah. According to 2 Sam. vi. the account of Michal, the daughter of Saul, who received David with contemptuous words, when he returned to his house, ought to follow here; but although the historian evidently hints at the circumstance, he does not relate it. His work was not of such a nature as to leave him room to introduce purely personal matters and trifling incidents of this kind, for he was anxious to return as quickly as possible to his account of the sacred institutions.

## 7. Chap. xvii.—Chap. xxii.

DAVID WISHES TO BUILD A TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM. HE MAKES THE NECESSARY PREPARATIONS, BUT THE ERECTION OF THE BUILDING ITSELF IS LEFT FOR SOLOMON. CHAPS. XVIII.—XXI. FORM A PARENTHESIS CONTAINING ACCOUNTS OF DAVID'S WARS, HIS OFFICERS, &C.

1. Chap. xvii. cf. 2 Sam. vii.—V. 1. *In his house;* we have an account of the erection of this house in chap. xiv. 1 (cf. xv. 1). In 2 Sam. vii. 1 the words "his house" are followed by the clause, "*and when Jehovah had given him rest from all his enemies round about,*" and the events here narrated are assigned to the latter part of David's reign. The fact, that the many wars, in which David was engaged, are not mentioned earlier either in the book of Samuel, or that of Chronicles, may be ac-

counted for on the ground, that a strictly chronological arrangement was not intended. The accounts of the preparation of the tent for the ark of the covenant in Jerusalem and of the intended erection of the temple, which are closely connected so far as their contents are concerned, follow immediately the one upon the other.—*In a house of cedars;* the magnificent house, which had been built with the help of Hiram (chap. xiv. 1). *Under curtains;* an explanatory alteration of the expression in Samuel, *in the midst of curtains (Thenius).* V. 2. *Do all this in thine heart;* in 2 Sam. we have *go, do, &c.;* and we also find there, as in many other instances, *Elohim* in the place of *Jehovah.* Thus Nathan at first expresses approval of the king's intention, *bona intentione, et sincero animo, non tamen ex divina revelatione. (J. D. Michaelis).* It was not till afterwards that he learned that the period had not yet arrived for the fulfilment of this design.—V. 4. The question in 2 Sam. vii. "*shalt thou build,*" *&c.*, implies that he will not. In the passage before us it is altered into the negative clause "*thou shalt not build me a house,*" *&c.*, (cf. chap. xxii. 8). *A house to dwell in;* for לָשָׁבֶת we find in Sam. vii. בַּיִת לְשִׁבְתִּי; this is no doubt the original reading, as "*for my dwelling*" forms a direct contrast to the words which follow, "*I have not dwelt;*" and the *baith* in the following verse is also without the article.—V. 5. And I was *from one tent to another, and from one dwelling;* to render these words intelligible it is necessary to supply: *to another* (dwelling). The correct reading has been preserved in Samuel, "*and I was walking in a tent and in a dwelling;*" the text of the passage before us has originated in the alteration of מתהלך (walking) into מֵאֹהֶל (from a tent). The evident intention, as we may see from v. 6, was to lay stress upon the fact that God was a *mithhallek* (a travelling God) and went from one place to another with his *tent* and his entire *dwelling* (the dwelling included not merely the tent but the forecourts with the altar of burnt-offerings, &c.)—V. 6. In addition to minor points, there is this difference between 2 Sam. and our text, that instead of "*the judges of Israel*" we find in the former *the tribes of Israel:* "*spake I a word with any of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people, to the effect,*" *&c.* "As the whole section possesses a poetical character, and the expres-

sion 'to feed,' which follows, does not harmonise with 'the tribes,' it is possible that this word may be used in a figurative sense, viz., shepherd-staffs = shepherds = rulers, and thus denote the judges." *(Thenius).* There can be no doubt that if we are anxious to retain the reading as it stands in Samuel, we must explain the word in some such way as this; for we read nothing about tribes who were commissioned to feed the congregation of Israel before the time of David, and the leaders, who had been called by God in earlier times, form a much more appropriate antithesis to David, than the tribes. But for that very reason, as it is easy to account for the alteration of שׁפטי into שׁבטי, by a copyist's oversight, seeing that *all Israel* had been mentioned just before, the reading of the Chronicles must be retained; and in my opinion this reading is confirmed by v. 10 and 2 Sam. vii. 11. *House of cedars;* a brief and expressive term for a house constructed of costly materials.—Vv. 7—14. *Words of the prophet Nathan.* V. 7. The reference in this verse is to the circumstances narrated in 1 Sam. xvi. 11.—V. 8. *And I cut off;* in 2 Sam. vii. the word in the original is written with the sign of motion (*a*), expressive of determination: *I resolved to cut off.* It follows from the context that this resolution was carried into effect.—*I have made thee a name;* 2 Sam. vii., "a *great* name." *Like the name of the great men that are on the earth;* for David had become the king of a great kingdom, and his fame could, therefore, be placed on a level with that of the powerful heathen kings, to whom the term *the great* was especially applied.—V. 9. *And I will give my people Israel a settled place, and will plant them, and they shall dwell in their place;* the perfects with *vav conjunctive* are not a continuation of the imperfects with vav conjunctive in v. 8; but after the enumeration of the blessings already bestowed upon David (v. 8), the promise is given, that Israel shall henceforth enjoy the blessings of David's age as a permanent inheritance, and shall dwell in safety in its own land. *And evil men shall not continue to waste them* (2 Sam. vii. *afflict* them) as in *the early times,* viz., when the Egyptians oppressed the people.—V. 10. *And up to the days* (the singular in 2 Sam. vii. points out the time with greater precision: from the present moment back to *the day) when I appointed judges.* These words denote the whole of the interval between

Joshua and Saul, in which the Israelites were frequently oppressed by heathen nations. *And I will subdue all thy enemies;* a continuation of the promise, which was commenced in v. 9. As God had already destroyed all the enemies of David, according to v. 8, and the promise refers to the enemies of Israel and not to those of David, the only way in which we can explain the use of the second person sing. suffix is by assuming, that the enemies of the people are at the same time regarded as the enemies of David himself. But the difficulty can be more easily removed by changing the suffix into the third person. The reading in 2 Sam. vii. 11 is, "I have given thee rest from all thine enemies;" and on comparing vv. 1 and 9 we shall see very clearly that the suffix ought to be changed from the second person to the third in the passage before us.—*And I have announced* (the imperfect with *Vav* as in v. 8) *to thee: "and a house will Jehovah build thee;"* our historical books do not inform us where and on what occasion this announcement was made by God to David (the first person refers to God, not to Nathan, as the reading in 2 Sam. vii., "*Jehovah telleth thee,*" clearly proves). The intention of the words is to give prominence to the fact that, according to the will and counsel of God, David was to receive a house, but not to build the temple (cf. v. 12); hence the reading in this verse, "*and I have announced,*" is to be regarded as the correct one. The house is not the palace, which David had built for himself, v. 25. The text of 2 Sam. vii., "*and Jehovah will announce to thee, that Jehovah will build thee a house,*" would have to be explained in this way: and Jehovah now announces to thee, through me, Nathan, that he will provide for thee a permanent and blessed house, that is, will bestow upon thy house blessing and prosperity, and give thee a perpetual posterity.—V. 11. *To go* (and lie) *with thy fathers* (Deut. xxxi. 16).—V. 12. *He shall build me a house;* in Samuel the reading is, "he shall build a house for my name," and instead of "his throne," we find in Samuel "the throne of his kingdom."—V. 13. "*He shall be my son;*" these words are followed in Samuel by a clause, which the historian has intentionally omitted here, viz., "if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the children of men," *i.e.*, in precisely the same manner

as I punish other men—*I will not take away my mercy* (Sam. my mercy shall not depart); *Thenius* regards the text of the Chronicles as the original reading, because, according to the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, the *Syriac*, the *Arabic*, and some MSS., אסיר (I will take away) is the correct reading of the passage in Samuel also, and this reading is confirmed by the word הסירותי which follows. But this word may have caused the alteration from Kal into Hiphil.—*From him that was before thee, i.e.*, Saul; the name of Saul is given in Samuel, but was no doubt interpolated by a copyist, as an explanation of the words, which were clear enough already, and from which the name was intentionally omitted by the prophet. In consequence of this interpolation the words "I took away" ("put away," Eng. V.) have been repeated, and מִלְּפָנֶיךָ is used in the sense of לְפָנֶיךָ, as we have it in the Chronicles. The text of the Chronicles is in all respects sufficient, and bears the stamp of originality when compared with that of Samuel. *Thenius*, however, endeavours to prove that it is the result of conjecture.—V. 14. *And I will place him in my house and in my kingdom for ever* (cf. 2 Chr. ix. 8). It is evident that "*in my house*" means in my people Israel, in my congregation, since "*in my kingdom*" follows immediately afterwards. But it is worthy of note that the word kingdom is applied here to the kingdom of God, whereas in every other passage, in which it occurs in this section, it denotes the kingdom of David or of Solomon. We naturally expect the prophet to revert to David before concluding, after having spoken in vv. 11—13 of the building of Solomon's temple. The promise that his house should be blessed was intended as a compensation for the disappointment of his wish to build the temple, and hence this assurance is appropriately repeated at the conclusion of the prophet's address. The text of 2 Sam. vii. gives the termination of the address precisely in the form in which we should expect to find it: "*and thy house and thy kingdom will continue for ever before thee, and thy throne* (according to this our כסאו should be altered into כִּסְאֲךָ) *shall be established for ever.*"—V. 15. *This vision;* it is apparent from v. 3, that the *vision* of the prophet was a vision in a dream.

Vv. 16—27. Cf. 2 Sam. vii. 18—29. *David's thanksgiving for*

*the promise made to him through Nathan.*—V. 16. *Then king David went in;* viz., into the sanctuary which he had erected.—*Jehovah Elohim;* 2 Sam. vii. *Adonai Jehovah;* a difference in the text which did not affect the Masoretic punctuation. In both cases the Masorites read *Adonai Elohim.*—V. 17. למרחוק an accusative governed by תדבר, what *thou sayest* relates *to a distant period;* the reference here is to v. 14.—וראיתני כתור האדם למעלה (Eng. version "thou hast regarded me according to the estate of a man of high degree," TR.); if instead of וראיתני we read והראיתני the meaning of these words will be: *and thou hast caused me as it were to see the succession of men from this time upwards;* in other words, the line of men, which stretched onward from David in an unbroken series into the remote future, appears as an ascending line rising upward to an immeasureable distance. Such a line was now presented to the view of David in the assurance that his throne should be firmly established to eternity, an assurance which involved the promise that the descendants of David should retain the government in an unbroken succession. The attempts made to explain the Kal וראיתני have all been unsuccessful. If the reading of our text is retained, we are forced to the assumption that תור is used here in the sense of תורה, but no evidence can be adduced in support of this assumption except the parallel passage in Samuel, where we find וזאת תורת האדא. And this would by no means clear away the difficulties, for even granting that the passage might mean, "*thou regardest me after the manner of men,*" *i.e.,* thou hast looked upon me as one with whom, although he is infinitely below thee, thou couldst converse after the manner of men, and hast not refused to speak to me as one man to another, the word המעלה would still need to be explained. Some have taken this word in connection with the clause which follows, and rendered it somewhat in this way: *thou regardest me after the manner of men, of whom God on high is the Lord* (*Luther* and *De Wette*). But this is altogether inadmissible, and hence in 2 Sam. vii., where תור is changed into תורת, the word המעלה has been omitted as superfluous. Other explanations, such for example as "et respexisti me juxta rationem hominis illius celsissimi" (*Schmidius*), are seen at once to be thoroughly arbitrary, the agreement with the Hebrew text being retained in appear-

ance only. The same may be said of the early versions (the *Septuagint: καὶ ἐπεῖδές με ὡς ὅρασις ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὕψωσάς με, Κύριε ὁ θεός*; *Vulgate: et fecisti me spectabilem super omnes homines, Domine Deus*), which merely serve to prove that at a very early period the text of this passage was unintelligible. We are therefore compelled to have recourse to an alteration of the text, and feel no hesitation in changing the Kal into Hiphil (reading "thou hast caused me to see" for "thou hast regarded me"), seeing that with this slight alteration the words would harmonize with the context, and the passage admit of an interpretation in all respects appropriate. The MSS. also furnish evidence that attempts have been made to render the passage intelligible by altering the text: thus some read בְּתוֹךְ (instead of כְּתוֹר) *thou regardest me on high in the midst of men*, thou givest me a preference above other men. The reading in the Chronicles is not an explanation of that in Samuel; on the contrary the original reading has been more closely retained in the former than in the latter, in which in fact it has been almost entirely obliterated by the alteration referred to and the omission of הראתני and המעלה.—V. 18. In the expression "*for the honour of thy servant*," the words "*of thy servant*" are omitted in the *Septuagint* and in 2 Sam. vii., and should certainly be erased from the text. The remainder of the passage, "*and what shall David still further add to thine honour*," corresponds with but little variation to 2 Sam vii.: "*and what shall David say more unto thee.*" The original text is undoubtedly found in the Book of Samuel, since the meaning of David evidently is, that God knows him, his servant, and therefore there is no necessity for him to give further expression to his feelings and his gratitude. —V. 19. *For thy servant's sake;* 2 Sam. vii.. *for thy word's sake.* The latter is clearly the original reading: *for thy word's sake and according to thy heart thou hast done all these great things, i.e.*, I attribute them to thy mercy alone. The concluding words of the verse must also be altered according to 2 Sam. vii., for the reading את־כל־הגדלות (all the great things) has evidently arisen from the words עַל כֵּן גָּדַלְתָּ (*therefore thou art great*), which we find in 2 Sam. vii. 22, but which are omitted from the Chronicles.—V. 21. Whom God *went* to redeem; *Thenius* (following the *Sep-*

*tuagint, ὡδήγησεν αὐτόν*) would substitute the Hiphil for the Kal here, and read: *whom God would have led, to redeem them to himself as a people* (cf. Deut. vii. 8, xiii. 5; from which passages, however, we should expect to find הוציא, see the *Septuagint* at Josh. xxiv. 3, Ps. cvi. 9); but if we take אֲשֶׁר as an Accusative: *to whom God came, to redeem a people to himself,* there will be no ground at all for changing the Kal into Hiphil. The next clause is also unintelligible in the form in which it lies before us. According to 2 Sam. vii., where however the text is even more faulty than it is in this passage, "*and to do*" should be inserted after the words "make thee a name," thus: "*that thou mightest make thee a name, and do great and terrible things, to drive out the heathen nations before thy people, whom thou hast redeemed out of Egypt.*" Whether the text in Samuel should be altered accordingly is another question.—V. 24. *Let it even be established:* this is wanting in Samuel. It is repeated from *v.* 23 to show more clearly the connection with the words which follow, "*that thy name may be exalted.*" *Saying; i.e.*, in order that men may every where acknowledge it and *say*. The points of difference between this passage and that of Samuel are not of much importance. יהיה must be erased from the latter, for men are to say "*the house of David thy servant is established before thee,*" not it will be established.—V. 25. For "*O my God*" we find in Samuel the fuller expression "*O Lord of hosts, God of Israel.*" After "*he hath found,*" אֶת־לִבּוֹ, if not introduced into the text as in 2 Sam. vii., must be understood: *therefore thy servant hath taken heart* (gained courage) *to pray before thee, i.e.*, to offer this prayer to God. *The house, which God would build for David*, is to be understood (according to *v.* 10) as referring to the family, the dynasty of David.—V. 26. After "*thou art God*" we have in Samuel "and thy words are truth."—V. 27. הואלת לברך; 2 Sam. vii. הואל וּבָרֵךְ, the original reading, since it is not a reference to former blessings, but a prayer for the fulfilment of the promise, that is for the bestowal of fresh blessings, which most properly occurs at the end of the prayer. The conclusion, "*for thou blessest*" *&c.*, is given in a much fuller form in 2 Sam. vii.: "for thou, O Lord God, hast spoken it, and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever."

## 2. Chap. xviii.—Chap. xxi.

### ACCOUNT OF DAVID'S WARS, &c.

Chap. xviii. V. 1; cf. 2 Sam. viii. 1, where the latter part of the verse reads thus: *and David took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines, i.e.*, he deprived them of the power which they had hitherto exercised over Israel, as it is also stated in Ecclus. xlvii. 7: *Ἕως σήμερον συνέτριψεν αὐτῶν κέρας.* In the passage before us we read of a victory over the Philistines, by which *Gath and her daughters*, that is, no doubt, the Philistine city of Gath and the whole of the district belonging to it, came into David's possession. There is something singular in this account, for, in the time of Solomon, Gath was an independent state, governed by a king of its own. For this reason some have thought, that the reference here is not to Gath of the Philistines, but to Gath Rimmon in the tribe of Dan, which the Philistines held till the time of David (the latter fact they consider themselves justified in deducing from the passage before us). But the words of the historian apparently refer to a more important event, than the recovery of a small Israelitish town. We are unable to tell on what ground the historian interpreted the passage in Samuel, as denoting the capture of Gath and the province connected with it.

[*Keil* (p. 41) sees no difficulty here. He says: "If *Metheg-Ammah* means (as *Winer* supposes) the *bridle of the capital (frenum metropoleos)*, the paraphrase of the Chronicles is quite correct, for then the expression 'he took Metheg-Ammah out of the hand of the Philistines' would mean, he took away from the capital its supremacy over the Philistines. But if it means *arm-bridle* (as *Gesenius* explains it in his history of the Hebrew language, though he rejects this explanation in the Thesaurus and silently follows Winer) the meaning of the passage is, 'David brought the Philistines under his sway.' In either case it is evident that the author of the Chronicles has correctly interpreted the words of the Book of Samuel, though he has merely paraphrased them."]

Ver. 2. Cf. 2 Sam. viii. 2, where a somewhat different account is given of the treatment, to which the Moabite prisoners were subjected ("he measured them with a line casting them down to the ground, even with two lines measured he to put to death,) and with one full line to keep alive, and so the Moabites became David's servants.") It was probably in this war with Moab that *Benaiah* slew the two sons of the Moabite king (cf. chap. xi. 22.)

Vv. 3—8. cf. 2 Sam. viii. 3 seq. V. 3. *To establish*; in 2 Sam. we find "to recover," but the reading of the Chronicles must be substituted in Samuel also. *Thenius* follows the earlier expositors, and assumes that David must be understood as the subject of the clause "*when he went to strengthen his hand by the Euphrates.*" The meaning of the verse would then be that, "when he was seeking to accomplish the important task of securing at least one point, in which his kingdom might touch the Euphrates, this being the nearest river which flowed through extensive provinces," he defeated Hadarezer the King of Aram who opposed his expedition. But the position of the clause itself and the introduction of the name of David as the subject of ver. 4 (David took from him, &c.) render it more probable that the words in question refer to Hadarezer *(J. H. Michaelis, Ewald)*, so that they merely serve to fix the time when David gained the victory over Hadarezer. The situation of Zobah is more particularly described in the words "*towards Hamath*" (cf. 2 Chr. viii. 3), which are omitted from Samuel; but they do not enable us to determine its position with accuracy. *Zobah* is neither the town of *Nisibis* in Mesopotamia, as the earlier expositors and even *J. H. Michaelis* suppose (all that we learn from 2 Sam. x. 16 is that the influence of the king of Zobah extended even to the countries to the east of the Euphrates), nor the town of Haleb or Aleppo in Syria, to which the Jews of the middle ages gave the name of Zoba. On the contrary Zobah was most probably situated on the east (or a little to the north east, *Thenius*) of Damascus (cf. *Ewald* who identifies Zobah with the Zoba of Ptolemy.) *Hamath* was the well-known city of the Orontes, which was afterwards called Epiphaneia, and is now one of the most important cities in the Cis-Asiatic countries. *Hadarezer;* the name always occurs in this form in the Chronicles and

in 2 Sam. x. 16—19, but in 2 Sam. viii. 3 he is called Hadadezer. The latter is evidently the original form, since Hadad, the name of a Syrian deity, is frequently met with in Syrian proper names. V. 4. *And David took from him a thousand chariots;* the word *chariots* does not occur in the parallel passage in Samuel, but must be supplied from our text. Instead of 7000 horsemen, the number given in Samuel is 700; but "7000 horsemen would be in better proportion to 20,000 foot soldiers in the plains of Mesopotamia" *(Thenius)*; cf. chap. xix. 18. —*Then David lamed all the chariots, i.e.*, he lamed the horses and so made all the chariots useless (cf. Josh. xi. 6, 9); he merely reserved 100 chariots, including of course the horses belonging to them, either as a memorial of the victory *(Thenius)*, or to take them with him to Jerusalem in a triumphal procession, and afterwards destroy them (*Ewald*). V. 5. *Darmesek* (another name for Damascus) only occurs here and in the following verse. V. 6. After the decisive engagement, in which 22,000 Syrians were slain, David appointed *governors* or *officials* in the kingdom of Damascus. The word נְצִבִים is omitted from our text, but must be supplied from 2 Sam. viii.; see below at v. 13, where the concluding words of the verse occur again. V. 7. *The golden armour*; not the golden shields *(cf. Thenius.)* *Upon the servants;* this is the correct reading, and the אֶל in 2 Sam. viii. must be altered into עַל. *Brought them to Jerusalem;* after these words the Septuagint contains the following clause in Sam. viii: *and Shishak, the king of Egypt, took them, when he attacked Jerusalem in the days of Rehoboam the son of Solomon.* According to *Thenius* this clause originally formed part of the Hebrew text, see the *Septuagint* at 1 Kings xiv. 26. V. 8. *From Tibchath* (2 Sam. viii. *from Betach*); both of these readings may have sprung from Tebach, and this we regard as the original name, since we meet with it as the name of an Aramaean district or town belonging to the descendants of Nahor, Gen. xxii. 24. Whether Tebach may be set down as identical with the modern town of Taibeh, which is placed on the most recent maps to the north of Tadmor, under 35 deg. north lat., apparently on a caravan road from Aleppo to the Euphrates, is very questionable, for there is but little resemblance between the two names Taibeh and Tebach. *From Chun* (2 Sam. *from Berothai*)

the names are only to be met with in these two passages, for the conjecture that Berothai was the same place as the Berothah mentioned in Ezek. xlvii. 16 (cf. *Hitzig*) is hardly admissible, the towns of Hadadezer being situated farther to the east than the town of Berothah referred to in Ezekiel, which from the context either stood directly upon the Mediterranean Sea, or at least very near to the coast. What connection there is between the names Chun and Berothai we cannot determine. The supposition, which has frequently been expressed, that Chun was a later name for Berothai, has no further evidence to support it. As the agreement between the text of the two books in other cases would suggest the probability, that originally the same name occurred in both, and since it is possible that in consequence of obliterations Chun may have grown out of Berothai, we agree with *Thenius* in thinking the latter name the original reading. *Ewald*, in his Geschichte des Volks Israel, connects Berothai with Barathena (*Ptolem.* geogr. v. 19), which was situated in the same latitude as Damascus, but nearer to the Euphrates. רבה מאד (2 Sam. viii. הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד); the reading in Samuel is more in accordance with the earliest usage, but is sometimes met with in the Chronicles (I. xx. 2). The concluding words "*therewith Solomon made the brazen sea, and the pillars and the vessels of brass,*" are omitted from the Hebrew text of 2 Sam. viii. but not from the *Septuagint*, where we find them in a somewhat more expanded form; they are also given in the *Vulgate*. It is therefore natural to suppose that they originally formed part of the Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel.

Vv. 9—11. cf. 2 Sam. viii. 9—12.—V. 9 *Tou;* in 2 Sam. *Toi.* It is evident from verse 3 that the land of Hadadezer was contiguous to the territory of king Toú of Hamath; and although we meet with Hamath-zobah in 2 Chr. viii. 3, the combination merely furnishes a more precise description of the situation of Hamath, but fails to convey any information to us, since we have no definite account of the extent of the kingdom of Zobah. Toú made presents to David, because the victory which David had gained over Hadadezer had delivered him from a powerful enemy, who had already made attempts to subdue his neighbour, as *v.* 10 evidently shows.—V. 10. *Hadoram;* the name

Joram has been written by mistake in 2 Sam. viii.; the latter is a purely Israelitish name, and therefore we should not expect to find it as the name of an Aramaean. The name Hadoram occurs in chap. i. 21 in the midst of Arabic names. We also find it in 2 Chr. x. 18 as a somewhat altered form of Adoram, 1 Kings xii. 18. לשאל לו לשלום, not as the Septuagint renders it, τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην, and the *Vulgate*, *ut postularet ab eo pacem*, but *to greet him* (cf. Genesis xliii. 27).—איש מלחמות, according to chap. xxviii. 3 and Is. xlii. 13, is *one who wages wars;* but in this passage it is more precisely defined by the name Toú, which is governed by the construct state. Hadadezer is here described as *a man of the wars of Toú*, that is, one who had made war upon Toú (cf. Is. xli. 12, *the men of thy war*). The closing words of the verse, *and all kinds of vessels of gold and silver and brass*, are in the accusative, and governed by the verb *he sent;* in 2 Sam. viii. they form a distinct sentence, "*in the land of Hadoram were all kinds of vessels,*" *&c.*—V. 11. The silver and gold *which he had taken* (2 Sam. which he had dedicated); according to the reading of our text David consecrated to Jehovah all the silver and gold which he had taken from the subjugated tribes; but this does not harmonise with the account contained in the Septuagint at 2 Sam. viii. 7, from which we learn that the golden armour of the warriors of Hadadezer was not placed in the sanctuary of Jehovah. Hence the reading in Samuel must be preferred, and the meaning of the passage evidently is that David dedicated the presents of Toú to the sanctuary, for which he had already determined to set apart a portion of the booty taken from the conquered kings. The last words of the verse, "*from all nations, from Edom and from Moab, and from the sons of Ammon, and from the Philistines and from Amalek,*" are given more fully in 2 Sam. viii., as follows: *from all nations whom he had conquered, from Aram* (for which, according to the passage before us, and according to the Septuagint and the Syriac versions of Samuel itself, *Edom* must be substituted, since the plunder obtained from Aram is mentioned again immediately after as that taken from Hadadezer, and Edom is more appropriately placed next to Moab, which bordered on Edom, than Aram would be) *and from Moab and from the*

*sons of Ammon, and from the Philistines, and from Amalek, and from the spoil of Hadadezer the son of Rehob, king of Zoba.*

Vv. 12, 13; cf. 2 Sam. viii. 13, 14.—V. 12. We must not shrink from attempting to ascertain the connection between these two accounts, which differ so widely the one from the other. As the concluding words, "*in the valley of salt eighteen thousand*" (for which, through a copyist's error, we find *twelve thousand* in Ps. lx. 2), also occur in 2 Sam. viii. 13, we must necessarily assume that, notwithstanding the different readings at the commencement of the verse, the two passages refer to the same event. The text of 2 Sam. viii. 13 is quite unintelligible in the form in which we have it now. If we examine the superscription of Ps. lx. (which is taken from the Book of Samuel, like the superscriptions in the neighbouring Psalms, and is therefore of importance for the interpretation, or rather we may say for the restoration, of the text), and 1 Kings xi. 15, we cannot doubt that the suffix in בשובו (*on his return*) relates to Joab ben Zeruiah. We conjecture, then, that the two passages, viz., that in the Chronicles and the parallel passage in Samuel, contain each a portion of the original reading, which may therefore be restored by combining the two so as to read, "*and Joab the son of Zeruiah smote Edom, when he returned from the conquest of Aram in the valley of salt,* 18,000 *men.*" We take no notice here of the words of 2 Sam. viii. 13, "*and David gat him a name,*" since they do not affect the explanation of the text of the Chronicles, and proceed at once to the words which follow, viz., "*when he returned from the conquest of Aram.*" By the omission of the name Joab ben Zeruiah (which may have been left out by a careless copyist, who thought it unnecessary here, as it occurs again at *v.* 16) and of the words "*he smote Edom*" (an omission which may readily be explained, as the eye might easily pass from this expression to the similar one further on "*from smiting Aram*"), the text which has come down to us in the book of Samuel may have grown out of that which we have given above. The reading in the Chronicles can also be traced to the restored texts as given above, since the words "*on his return from smiting Aram*" might easily be overlooked on account of their resemblance to the preceding words "*he smote Edom,*" and some reader who doubted the correctness of the text may have been induced to substitute the name of Abishai ben

Zeruiah, which he missed from the list of names in *v.* 15 sqq., for that of Joab ben Zeruiah which occurs immediately after. The present readings in 2 Sam. viii. and in the Chronicles are thus shown to point to the text, as restored by their aid, and the contents of this restored text are in harmony with the account contained in 1 Kings xi. 15 and Ps. lx. 2. It may indeed be said, that we are not justified in seeking such a harmony, since it is possible, either that different events are referred to in the passages quoted, or that different accounts existed of the same event. Thus for example *Movers* says (p. 170): "according to 2 Sam. viii. 13, David slew the Edomites in the valley of salt; the superscription of Ps. lx. refers this slaughter to Joab, the commanding officer, whilst the author of the Chronicles, copying almost verbatim from the Book of Samuel, substitutes Abishai the son of Zeruiah, an alteration which he could only have been induced to make by the account contained in some other historical work." Earlier expositors on the other hand (*e.g. Buxtorf* Vind. p. 401 sqq. *Pfeiffer* dub. Vex. p. 461 seq. *J. H. Michaelis* in loco) reconcile the different statements somewhat in the following manner. Abishai ben Zeruiah slew the Edomites (according to the passage before us), and after them their allies (?) the Syrians (according to 2 Sam. viii). He slew 18,000 in the first engagement (?), and then a second attack was made by Joab ben Zeruiah (according to 1 Kings xi. 15), in which 12,000 men were slain (Ps. lx. 2); *Keil* p. 239 gives a similar explanation. (The explanation given by *Keil* is not quite the same; he says "the account of the Chronicles is taken from a historical source, for the author of the Chronicles introduces the special information that it was Abishai the son of Zeruiah who slew the Aramaeans (? the Edomites). It cannot have been taken from the superscription to the Psalm, for it differs in two respects: (1) it gives 18,000 as the number of the slain (the same number is given in Samuel) and only 12,000 are mentioned in the Psalm. *J. H. Michaelis* in Ps. lx. 2 has shown that there is no actual discrepancy between the two statements, and cites a striking case in point from the seven years' war. (2) It attributes the victory to Abishai, and the superscription to the Psalm ascribes it to Joab. This difference was solved by *Calvin*, and after him by *J. D. Michaelis* as follows: Joab may have commanded the

army, but a detachment, led by Abishai, may have attacked the Edomites and slain them. In this case the victory would just as properly be attributed to the commander in chief as to the subordinate officer." (*Chronik* p. 239, 240 *Tr.*).—It is at once apparent that the solution offered by *Buxtorf* and the others is not admissible. The variations in individual notices, occurring in passages that agree almost word for word, point to a common original text, which has been mutilated by subsequent alterations; and hence our task is to restore the text to its primitive form. *Ewald* and *Thenius* admit this, and though they have attempted to solve the difficulty in a somewhat different way, in the essential points we are agreed.—V. 13. *Then the Edomites became subject to David;* in 2 Sam. viii. it is said still more emphatically, *he appointed officers in all Edom, and all the Edomites became subject to David.* We can hardly suppose that the clause, "*he appointed officers in all Edom,*" has been intentionally omitted, since it may easily have been dropped from the text by mistake on account of its resemblance to the preceding clause. On the last clause of the verse *cf.* v. 6; the account of the wars with Edom is here brought to a close.

V. 14—17; *cf.* 2 Sam. viii. 15—18.—V. 14. The summary contained in this verse forms a conclusion not only to the brief account of the wars of David given in this chapter, but to the whole of the history of David's reign. Its position here in the centre of that history can only be explained on the supposition that in the original source from which this account of the wars was drawn, it did stand at the end of the history of David along with the list of officers which follows. The history of Saul is brought to a close in 1 Sam. xiv. 47—52 with the same details, and in very similar words.—V. 16. *Abimelek;* the correct reading is *Ahimelek,* which we find in 2 Sam. viii. and the other passages in which the name occurs (*e.g.* 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, 6). It is singular that this Ahimelek should be called a son of Abiathar, for according to 1 Sam. xxii. 20 Abiathar was a son of Ahimelek, and in other passages Zadok, of the line of Eleazar, and Abiathar, of the line of Ithamar, are mentioned together as the two high priests in the time of David (*e.g.* 2 Sam. xv. 24, 35, xx. 25). *Thenius* and *Ewald* (Gesch. des Volks Isr. ii. p. 596) are therefore of opinion that the names must be here transposed so as to read Abiathar *the son of Ahime-*

*lek.* We should not hesitate to bring this passage into harmony with the account in 1 Sam. xxii. 20 by means of such a transposition were it not that a high priest Ahimelek is spoken of in 1 Chr. xxiv. 3—31 along with Zadok, and in v. 6 he is called the son of Abiathar. The high priests of the line of Ithamar, whom we must keep in view when pronouncing upon the reading in question, were the following: Ahiah or Ahimelek, his son Abiathar, his son Ahimelek. We frequently find the grandfather and grandson called by the same name (see, for example, the list of high priests of the line of Eleazar, 1 Chr. v. 30—41). Hence the author of the Chronicles was acquainted with an Ahimelek, son of Abiathar, who discharged the duties of high priest in David's reign, and during the lifetime of his father (for Abiathar was living in the time of Solomon, 1 Kings ii. 27). This Ahimelek is mentioned here, as well as in 1 Chr. xxiv. 36 and 31, in connexion with Zadok. The historical books do not furnish us with any information as to the circumstances which led to Ahimelek's appointment as high-priest during his father's lifetime, or as to the reason why Ahimelek is not mentioned in connexion with the deposition of Abiathar by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 27, 35). But so much is certain that we have no right to alter the reading of the text and, by a transposition of the names, read *Abiathar the son of Ahimelek* for *Ahimelek the sno of Abiathar*, for in that case we should have to alter *Ahimelek* into *Abiathar* in 1 Chr. xxiv. 3, and *Ahimelek the son of Abiathar* into *Abiathar the son of Ahimelek* in chap. xxiv. 6, and again *Ahimelek* into *Abiathar* in v. 31.—*Savsha* (2 Sam. xiv. *Seraiah*); the text contains the original reading; for in 1 Kings iv. 3 the same man, as we may safely assume, is spoken of under the name of *Shisha*, and in 2 Sam xx. 25 under that of *Sheva* or *Sheja*; which of these three names is correct we are not in a position to decide.—V. 17. *And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the Kreti and Pleti;* the same words occur in 2 Sam. xx. 23, and the reading of 2 Sam. viii. 18, which is founded upon 1 Kings i. 38, 44, must be corrected accordingly. On the Kreti and Pleti who formed the special body-guard of David (2 Sam. viii. 18, xv. 18, xx. 7, 23; 1 Kings i. 38, 44), see my Beiträge zur Geschichte der Israeliten p. 186—200.—On *Benaiah* see 1 Chr. xi. 22—25. —*And the sons of David were the first by the side of the king;*

we have here an explanation of the obsolete word *Cohanim*, which is applied to the sons of David in 2 Sam. viii. 18. This view of the connexion between the word *Cohanim* and the reading in the passage before us is confirmed by 1 Kings iv. 5, where the words "כֹּהֵן רֵאֳה" occur together in the sense of *minister*.

(On this *Keil* has the following fuller note: "*Gesenius* and *Winer* have both denied that *Cohanim* in the Book of Samuel denotes superior officers, and maintain that David had actually *priests* (house or palace-priests) among his own sons. But apart from the impossibility of proving the existence of such palace-priests, this supposition falls at once to the ground from the fact, that *Cohen* first received the meaning of *priest* from common usage and not from the etymology, and that the context prohibits the application of this usage in the case before us. The radical signification of *Cohen*, in the Arabic, is *res alicujus gerere, to act as the plenipotentiary of another*, in the Syriac *cehan* means *dives, gloriosus fuit*, and the adjective *cahinoh, locuples, dives.* In the latter sense the word *Cohanim* is used in Job xii. 19, where the parallel word '*the mighty*' shews that it can only refer to secular magnates (cf. *Rosenmüller* Schol. ad h. l.) It is in this earlier sense, 'men of high rank,' 'plenipotentiaries of the king,' that the word is used here and in the Book of Samuel. For it is evident that the reference cannot be to actual priests, since Zadok and Ahimelek are mentioned in v. 17 as priests of the tribe of Levi. And the author felt it to be unnecessary to observe that the sons of David were *Cohanim* in a different sense, for he could assume that every theocrat would know this very well. . . . The sons of David had this title given them, because they were the mediators and representatives of the king, just as the priests were mediators between the people and the invisible king of the theocracy." *Chronik* p. 347.)

Chap. xix.—xx. 3. On chap. xix. cf. 2 Sam. x. Between the history of the wars of David, contained in 1 Chr. xviii., and that of his wars with the sons of Ammon and Aram in 1 Chr. xix., we find in 2 Sam. ix. an account of David's conduct towards Saul's son Mephibosheth (Meribosheth), which was necessarily omitted from the Chronicles as not coming within the scope of the work. —V. 1. *After that;* a loose formula of connexion, intended undoubtedly to give some chronological arrangement to the diffe-

rent accounts, though it is evident that they do not follow one another in a strictly chronological order. The use of this formula, therefore, in the passage before us is not at variance with the opinion that the chapter contains a more detailed account of the wars with Aram and Hadadezer, to which a brief reference had already been made in chap. xviii. 3—5. *Nachash* (a name which has been omitted by a simple oversight, from 2 Sam. x. 1) was the king of Ammon, with whom Saul is said in 1 Sam. xi. 1 to have carried on war. The friendly connexion which existed between Nachash and David, according to the account in the Chronicles, may perhaps have been occasioned by the hostile relation in which both of them stood to Saul. After *his son*, the name Hanun should be inserted; it is found in 2 Sam. x. 1, and is very appropriately given at the commencement of an account of Hanun himself.—V. 2. The text of 2 Sam. x. differs in certain words from the passage before us, but the only instance in which it is allowable to alter one text from the other is in the case of אל אבין for which על may be substituted, cf. Is. xxii. 4; Ezek. xiv. 22.—V. 3. The first question, "*doth David honour thy father?*" is introduced with הֲ, the second with הֲלֹא, because a negative reply is expected to the former, an affirmative to the latter. After the words "*to search*" we must supply "*the city*" (2 Sam. x.), *i.e.*, the capital of Ammon (Rabba); the infinitives, which follow, with their object *the land* must be transposed, and connected together as in 2 Sam. x., after erasing the word *Erez* (land) with the suffix, for *spying* must precede overthrowing, and the latter word, according to its signification, is applicable to a city rather than a land.—V. 4. *And shaved them;* in 2 Sam. x. we have the more particular account *he shaved off the half of their beard, i.e.*, he shaved off the beard from one half of their face. מדוֽיהם only occurs here and at 2 Sam. x. (cf. the cognate word מַד, Lev. vi. 3) it is used for *clothes which reach to the feet;* they were cut off by the Ammonites *in the middle*, that is, the skirt was cut off as high up as "their hinder parts." *V.* 5. "*And they went;*" these words are not required on account of the preceding expression, *he sent them away*, and are omitted from 2 Sam. x. *And information was brought to David respecting these men;* the same words occur in the *Septuagint* version of Samuel, but the words "*respecting these*

*men*" are wanting in the Hebrew text. The ambassadors had probably come as far as *Jericho* on their way back from the land of the Ammonites, they were to tarry there till the mark of the insult they had received had disappeared, and then *return* to Jerusalem. V. 6. התבאשו (the Niphal is used in 2 Sam. x.) the Hithpael of this verb only occurs here. In the later period of the language the Hithpael was frequently employed for the Niphal. The Niphal with את (2 Sam. xvi. 21) answers to the construction with את here. The words, *a thousand talents of silver to hire them chariots and horsemen from Aram-Naharaim, and from Aram Maachah, and from Zobah,* are omitted from 2 Sam. x., where nothing is said of the price at which the troops were hired; but the tribes who were ready to furnish them, are mentioned at once in words which differ but little from the first part of verse 7. Instead of *Aram-Naharaim* we find in Samuel *Aram-beth-Rehob,* it is probable that Beth-rehob was supposed to be the same city as *Rehoboth-hannahar,* which is mentioned in Gen. xxxvi. 37, and hence the uncommon name Aram-beth-Rehob was exchanged for the well-known name *Aram of the two rivers.* But this explanation could hardly be correct, for it is expressly said that it was not till a later period of the war that the inhabitants of Aram beyond the Euphrates, *i.e.* in Mesopotamia, took part in the war (cf. v. 16), and, therefore, we must look for Aram-beth-Rehob in the neighbourhood of the country of the Ammonites. We conjecture that it was that part of Syria, in which, according to Judg. xviii. 28, the city of Beth-Rehob stood; the position of this city we cannot more exactly determine, but it must have been somewhere near the southern slope of Antilebanon. *Aram-maachah* (called simply Maachah in 2 Sam. x.), the country by which the possessions of the Israelites on the east of the Jordan were bounded towards the north (Deut. iii. 14; Josh. xii. 5, xiii. 11); the statement of *Jerome* agrees with this, viz., that the city of Maachah was situated at the sources of the Jordan on the western slope of the southern portion of Antilebanon (cf. v. *Raumer,* Palestine Ed. 2, p. 206). We have no account in the Old Testament of the extent of this small kingdom of Maachah. *Zobah* (called in Samuel Aram-Zobah); on the situation of Zobah see chap. xviii. 3. V. 7. *And they hired thirty and two thousand chariots, and the king of Maachah and his*

*people;* according to 2 Sam. x. 6 Aram Beth-Rehob, and Aram contributed 20,000 foot soldiers, the king of Maachah 1000 men, and the kingdom of Tob 12,000 men. Thus the numbers agree, for the 20,000 and 12,000 are the 32,000 of the Chronicles, to which must be added the people of the king of Maachah, who, according to the more precise account of the Book of Samuel, furnished 1000 men. The difference in the two accounts consists in this, (1) that the land of Tob, which must have been somewhere near the other countries mentioned here, is altogether omitted from the Chronicles, for what reason we cannot tell (*Ewald*, Gesch. ii. p. 617 identifies Tob with the *Θαῦβα* of Ptolemy, a place in the desert of Arabia, but the passages of the Old Testament, in which the land of Tob is referred to, indicate a more northerly position), and (2) that the mercenary troops are described in the Chronicles as רכב, and according to the previous verse *Receb* and *Perashim*, whereas in Samuel they are said to have been all *foot soldiers*,—a remarkable statement, when we consider that in other passages (*e.g.* 1 Chr. xviii. 4) the King of Zobah is said to have had a great number of war chariots and horsemen at his disposal. The account contained in the verse before us of the *encampment* of the mercenary troops before *Medeba*, a city of the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 16), and the statement that whilst they were besieging this city, *the Ammonites gathered together from their cities &c.*, are omitted from the text of Samuel. They certainly rest upon a historical basis, and were taken by the author of the Chronicles from the sources employed by him; they may perhaps have originally formed part of the text of Samuel, and from some oversight may have been omitted.

(On the difficulty connected with the numbers given in this passage *Keil* says: "It is evident that both passages are corrupt. It is true that the accounts agree as to the number of men whom the Ammonites hired, viz., 32,000 men, and 1000 men from the king of Maachah, but according to the Chronicles the 32,000 were not infantry but *Receb* (chariot-soldiers, or war-chariots with horses), and yet 40,000 foot soldiers were slain; according to the Book of Samuel the Ammonites hired none but infantry, and yet in the battle there were 700 *Receb* and 40,000 *Perashim* (horsemen) slain. It is not easy to determine how the two accounts are to be reconciled. For the plan, suggested by *Calmet*,

*J. H. Michaelis* and others, of combining them seems somewhat forced. There are probably copyists' errors in both passages. But, as *Clericus, Michaelis,* and others have already said, there is more internal probability in the statement contained in the Chronicles that 7000 *Recheb* were slain and 40,000 foot soldiers, than in that of Samuel that 40,000 horsemen were slain, and only 700 *Recheb,* and no foot soldiers at all." Chronik. p. 324). V. 8. *The whole army*; the article in this passage in Samuel shows more clearly that the expression "*the mighty men,*" is in apposition to "*the army*;"—viz., *the whole army, the Gibborim. Thenius* is of opinion that the copula has been dropt, and that the text should be restored so as to read, *the whole army and the Gibborim.* It is true that in 2 Sam. xv. 17 *the whole people,* and in 2 Sam. xx. 7, *the men of Joab and the Kreti and Pleti,* are mentioned in connection with Gibborim; but so far as I can remember, the rest of the warriors are never called *the whole army* in distinction from the Gibborim. It is evident from vv. 10, 11, that the rest of the warriors, as well as the Gibborim, took part in this war; but it does not therefore follow that they must be mentioned in this verse by the side of the Gibborim.—V. 9. *Outside the city; i.e.,* the city into which they withdrew after their defeat (v. 15). It must therefore have been the capital of the Ammonites, *Rabbah,* which was certainly the only one of the Ammonitish cities that was sufficiently fortified or large enough to afford a safe retreat to the conquered army. *And the kings that were come* (in 2 Sam. x., the four powers, which had sent auxiliary troops, are mentioned again by name) arranged the order of battle *for themselves alone upon the field,* after they had left the camp before Medeba and come near to the Ammonitish army. Instead of *outside the city,* we find in 2 Sam. x. *outside the gate* (of the city of Rabbah). Our reading is preferable as being the more intelligible, for the context evidently shows that the city of Rabbah is meant; and the very indefinite expression *outside the gate* does not harmonize with the peculiar clearness of the rest of the account; moreover, the words in v. 15 and 2 Sam. x. 14 "*they entered into the city*" require the reading "*outside the city,*" rather than "the gate," in the passage before us.—V. 10. *The face of the battle &c.; i.e.,* the *battle-array* of the two armies was directed against him: the

Ammonites were drawn up *in front*, and the auxiliary troops which had advanced from Medeba were *behind*. Joab himself, at the head of a select body of soldiers, attacked the latter, which formed the stronger power, and is designated by the common name of *Aram*.—V. 11. His brother Abishai, with the rest of the army, was directed to attack the Ammonites. V. 12. והושעתך (2 Sam. x. והלכתי להושיע לך); in the mouth of Joab, who was resolved to fight bravely, but knew well that the results were in the hands of God, the expression was very seemly, "*I will go to bring thee help*," I will try to help thee.—V. 13. *Let us behave ourselves;* the particle of motion (*He*) is appended to make the hortative character of the word more apparent, but the word may have the same meaning when used without the particle, as in 2 Sam. x.—*For our people and for the cities of our God*, that these may not fall into the hands of the enemy and so be given up to their gods.—V. 14. *Before Aram to battle* (2 Sam. x. *to battle against Aram*). When the Ammonites had retreated within the walls of their fortified city Rabbah, which the Israelites did not succeed in taking till the following year (chap. xx. 1), the war against Ammon was not carried any farther for the present.—V. 16. After their defeat the warriors of the countries designated by the common name of Aram assembled once more, and sent messengers to the Syrians beyond the Euphrates to induce them to join them in the war. According to the more precise account given in 2 Sam. x. 16, Hadadezer caused them to take part in the war; and from this statement as well as from the notice that his general *Shophach* was placed at their head, it seems to follow that the power of Hadadezer extended beyond the Euphrates, and that there were certain provinces to the east of the river, governed it may be by petty princes, which were dependent upon him and obliged to render assistance when required.—V. 17. *And came to them;* in 2 Sam. x. 17 we find "*and came to Helam*," the place in which, according to the previous verse, the Syrians had been gathered together; for חילם in 2 Sam. x. 16 is undoubtedly only a somewhat altered mode of writing חֵלָאם or חֵלָם, and in both passages the *Septuagint* and *Syriac*, and in the latter the *Vulgate*, treat the word as a proper name and write *Αἰλάμ* ܚܶܠܰܡ *Helam*. Some MSS. of

the Septuagint read *Χαλαμάκ*, in which we may easily detect the Hebrew *Halamah*. It is true that no place of that name is mentioned anywhere else in the Old Testament, and this may account for the fact that, in the first instance, it is omitted from the Chronicles, and in the second is changed into אלהם (*to them*), by which the superfluous remark, "*he came to them and drew up the army against them*," which was already implied in the next clause, was introduced into the text. *Thenius* thinks that the text of the Chronicles contains the original reading; but I am unable to perceive in what way the reading of Samuel could easily be derived from that of the Chronicles by the transposition of letters, and mere conjecture. It must also be borne in mind that in *Josephus* (Antiq. vii. 6. 3) the word occurs as a proper name. He considers Chelam to have been the name of a powerful king of the Syrians on the East of the Euphrates, who sent his general Sabekcs with an army of 80,000 foot and 10,000 cavalry to the assistance of the Ammonites. *Ewald* supposes Chelam to have been the name of a place corresponding to the city of Alamatha mentioned by Ptolemy geogr. xv. 5, the situation of which would answer very well to the description given here (compare chap. xviii. 3, "*when he went to strengthen his hand on the Euphrates*)."—V. 18. By *Aram* we must understand all the allied Syrians. Instead of 7000 chariots and 40,000 *foot-soldiers* we find in 2 Sam. x. 700 chariots and 40,000 horsemen. According to vv. 6 and 7 of this chapter and other passages chariots and horsemen constituted the principal force of the Syrians; and for this very reason it is all the more striking that in the present instance the Book of Chronicles should speak of foot-soldiers instead of horsemen. The statements are evidently inaccurate, for in Samuel the foot-soldiers are altogether omitted and in Chronicles the horsemen. We may perhaps possess a more detailed description of this victory of David in 1 Chr. xviii. 3 seq., and 2 Sam. viii. 3 seq., for it is not improbable that the brief notice contained in those passages refers to the decisive victory over Hadadezer, of which we have again an account in this same chapter in a more extended history of the wars with the Syrians.—V. 19. *The servants of Hadadezer* are, according to 2 Sam. x., the kings of the petty Syrian kingdoms which were dependent upon Hadadezer. The points in which the text of

this verse differs from that of Samuel are to be regarded as unintentional alterations, such as always occur where an exact copy is not specially aimed at.—Chap. xx. 1—3; cf. 2 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 26, 30, 31, where the conquest of Rabbah is connected with the history of Uriah. The Ammonites, having lost the support of the Syrians, are defeated and punished with the greatest severity for their ignominious treatment of the ambassadors of David (chap. xix. 4).—V. 1. *At the time of the turn of the year, the time when kings march out; i.e.*, at the beginning of the year, in the spring, when kings are accustomed to enter upon their warlike expeditions after the winter's rest. As we have no similar notice of the time in the 19th chapter, we may safely assume that all the wars referred to there occurred in the course of the previous year.—*And Joab led forth the power of the army;* more precisely in 2 Sam. xi., "*David sent Joab and his servants with him and all Israel;*" the expression חֵיל הַצָּבָא, which we only meet with here, like the similar words in 2 Chr. xxvi. 13, must denote the whole army, all the men who were capable of bearing arms.—*And he devastated the land of the sons of Ammon;* in 2 Sam. xi. 1 the word "land" is wanting, but it should be inserted in the text, since the land of the sons of Ammon is distinguished from the capital of the land, Rabbah, the siege of which is mentioned immediately afterwards. *David remained in Jerusalem;* he afterwards followed the army to Rabbah and returned with it to Jerusalem (v. 3). We are not informed here how it happened that David was personally engaged in the battle after all, and the account contained in this chapter would be unintelligible were it not that we can complete it from 2 Sam. xii. 26 sqq. We learn there that Joab had taken the royal city, *i.e.*, the capital. This city was composed of two distinct parts, the water-city, or the part which was built in the valley on the banks of the small river, which is now called the Nahr Amman, and the portion which was fortified. In order that David might have the honour of conquering the latter, as soon as Joab had taken the water-city he sent for David to come and besiege the city (*i.e.*, the fortress), and take it; and David went as was requested. The author of the Chronicles passes over all this, and contents himself with the brief notice, "*Joab smote Rabbah and destroyed it.*" It is not easy to reconcile the statement in

2 Sam. xii. 26 to the effect that Joab took the city with that in vv. 27, 28, where David himself is said to have taken it. Nor do I think the two passages can be successfully harmonised, except by assuming that *the royal city* mentioned in v. 26 was that part of the city which is called *the water-city* in v. 27. When this portion of the city had been taken and destroyed, the fortress, which Joab sent for David to reduce, could not possibly hold out long. So much, however, is certain, that the author of the Chronicles must have been fully acquainted with the whole narrative as contained in 2 Sam. xii. 26 sqq., for otherwise the two statements, "*David remained in Jerusalem*" (v. 1) and "*David and all the people returned to Jerusalem*" (v. 3), would be quite unintelligible.—V. 2. *And in it were precious stones;* this reading should also be substituted in Samuel for "*with the precious stones.*"—V. 3. וישר from the root שׂוּר, which only occurs here; the meaning to *cut* or *saw in pieces* is established by the word מְשׂוֹר a saw from the root נשר.—ובמגרות must be altered into ובמגזרות (a kind of *scythe*) according to 2 Sam., מגרה having been mentioned just before. Another fearful kind of punishment is spoken of in 2 Sam.: *he threw them into brick kilns.* Compare with this the severe punishment inflicted upon Moab, 2 Sam. viii. 2; and Amos i. 3; Prov. xx. 26.

Chap. xx. 4—8. cf. 2 Sam. xxi. 18—22. In 2 Sam. xxi. 15—22 we have very brief notices of victories gained by Israelitish heroes over giants in the land of the Philistines. It is probable that these notices were placed at the end of works containing the history of the wars of David. This would account for the fact, that in the second book of Samuel they form a loosely connected appendix at the close of the history of David, and in the Chronicles are inserted here at the end of the account of David's wars. In Samuel four heroes are named, who gained renown through their conflicts with Philistian giants; in the passage before us only three are mentioned. We cannot tell for what reason the historian has omitted the short account of the attack made upon David by the giant Ishbi-benob, who was slain by Abishai the son of Zeruiah (1 Sam. xxi. 15—17).—V. 4. *After this;* the same formula occurs in 2 Sam. xxi. 18, and there it connects the verse with the brief account of the conflict of David and Abishai with the giant Ishbi-benob. In the present instance the con-

junctive formula is still retained, although the event, to which it refers, is not mentioned at all, a clear proof of the loose manner in which it is used, and that it is of little worth in a chronological point of view, cf. chap xix. 1.—ותעמד probably arose from the corresponding words ותהי עוד in 2 Sam.; the expression *there stood a war* for "*a war arose*" occurs, so far as I am aware, in this passage alone.—*At Gezer;* cf. chap. vii. 28 seq. The name *Gob* in 2 Sam. should probably be altered into Gezer (cf. *Thenius*). *Sibbekai the Chushathite* was one of the Gibborim, as we learn from chap. xi. 29 compared with xxvii. 11.—*The children of Rapha* or the Rephaim in the land of the Philistines were a remnant of the aborigines. In the land of the Philistines the aborigines were called *Avvim;* they had been conquered by the Philistines who migrated from Caphtor (Deut. ii. 23). Certain families continued to live there under Philistine rule (cf. Josh. xi. 22), and from them the giants, mentioned in these verses, were descended. *And they* (the Philistines) *were humbled* (Judg. xi. 33; 1 Sam. vii. 13); these words are wanting in Samuel.—V. 5. The place where the conflict occurred is not named here, but in Samuel it is said to have happened בגוב (in Gob) probably the place called גב in the previous verse. In this verse also Gezer is most likely the true reading, in fact the resemblance to Gezer is greater in the latter instance than in the former.—*Elchanan;* not the Elchanan mentioned in chap. xi. 26.—The Keri *Ben-Jair* lies at the foundation of the present reading of the text of Samuel (*Jaare-oregim*). It is now generally admitted that יערי is יעיר with the letters transposed, and that the *oregim* has been taken by mistake from the following clause.—The concluding words of this verse differ very widely from 2 Sam., but it is at once apparent that however different the readings are now, the text was originally the same, for the letters of the words את-לחמי אחי in this passage and בית הלחמי את are very nearly alike. According to the reading of our text, which *Thenius* and many of the earlier scholars regard as the original, Elchanan the son of Jair slew Lachmi the brother of Goliath of Gath; according to the Book of Samuel Elchanan the son of Jair of Bethlehem slew Goliath of Gath. We are of opinion that the latter is the original account, for we can understand the growth of our reading out of that in Samuel, but cannot see how

the former could give rise to the latter. To a reader acquainted with the account of David's conflict with Goliath (1 Sam. xvii.) it could not but appear strange to meet with the statement here that Elchanan slew a giant Goliath, and we may certainly assume that no reader in ancient times would put such an explanation upon an illegibly written text. ("Nearly all the commentators, *e.g.*, *Clericus*, *J. H. and J. D. Michaelis*, *Dereser* and others, consider the text of Samuel to be corrupt, and correct it from that of the Chronicles." *Keil* p. 297.)—V. 6. אִשׁ מִדָּה is generally regarded as a substitute for the *Kethib* of 2 Sam. אִישׁ מָדִין, *middin* being taken as the plural of *mad* with the termination *in;* but *mad* does not mean *mensura* (cf. *Hitzig* on Jer. xiii. 25). In the place of the *Keri*, *madon (length)*, the common word *middah* is used in this passage. *And his fingers and toes were six each, together four and twenty;* in 2 Sam. the account is more elaborate, but our brief description is sufficiently clear. V. 8. אֵל, an abbreviation of אֵלֶּה; it only occurs nine times in the Old Testament, viz., in this passage without the article and eight times in the Pentateuch with the article. Its occurrence is therefore very striking here, for it is found nowhere else in the books of the Chronicles. The original reading we find in Samuel אֵלֶּה יֻלְּדוּ (the numeral *four* attached to these words was necessarily omitted here, as the previous accounts mention only *three* children of Rapha and not *four* as in 2 Sam. xxi.); from this, the *He* having become illegible, אֵל נוּלְּדוּ was formed, with a reference to chap. iii. 5; the *o* of the Niphal is here shortened into *u* and after the *U* vowel the Lamed is double (see the similar treatment of the Hophal in Ezek. xvi. 4, 5, and Gen. xl. 20): *And they fell by the hands of David and his servants;* this conclusion is also found in 2 Sam. xxi. 22. In the latter passage it more evidently suits the context, for there is at least one account of a conflict between David and a son of Rapha, viz., that with Ishbi Benob (v. 15—17), but the three sons of Rapha, who are mentioned here, were slain by Sibbekai, Elchanan and Jonathan.

Chap. xxi. 1—27. cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. *The numbering of the people and the pestilence.*—V. 1. The commencement of this section in 2 Sam. ("and *again* the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel") refers to the history of the famine, the first national plague

in David's reign (chap. xxi. 1—14), which is not recorded in the Chronicles. For this reason the section before us necessarily has a somewhat different commencement. That which is represented in 2 Sam. as the immediate effect of the wrath of God is here produced by the intervention of Satan, who remains subject to him and does not act by his own power. This *Satan stood up against Israel* to accuse the people before God and to bring calamity and punishment from him upon the nation. The result of his rising up against Israel was an attempt to establish his charge against the king, for the sin of the king would be sufficient to induce God to inflict suffering upon the people, in which the chastising hand of God would at the same time reach the king. Hence it is said "*and he provoked David* (precisely the same word is used in 2 Sam. where the subject is Jehovah, only בָּהֶם is added there, so that the meaning is: Jehovah provoked David against them, viz., against the Israelites, *i.e.*, he impelled him to perform an action which should prove injurious to the Israelites (cf. Jer. xliii. 3; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; Job. ii. 3) *to number Israel*," and David numbered the people and thus gave occasion to God to visit the people with a great plague, of which a description is given in the following verses. But in what way could the numbering of the people be regarded as a crime on the part of David? In the time of Moses the people had been numbered and God was not angry then. But on the occasion of that numbering the Israelites had each contributed half a shekel towards the building of the tabernacle, "that there might be no plague among them when (Moses) numbered them" (Ex. xxx. 11—16). Hence the numbering of the people in itself was regarded as an undertaking, by which the anger of God could be easily aroused, but when the arrangements were made by Moses for the taking of the census, God was not angry, because the people were numbered for the express purpose of the tax for the sanctuary, and the money which was thus collected ("the atonement money," Ex. xxx. 16) appeased him; compare the expiatory sacrifices of the Romans on the occasion of the census. Everything depends therefore upon the design of the census. As nothing is said respecting the design of the census instituted by David, we must endeavour to determine it by more general considerations. *Thenius* observes that in the author's view the sin

lay in the fact that David was prompted by pride, and a desire to set before his own eyes the greatness of his glory and power. This view is chiefly sustained by the words of Joab (*v.* 3); but the whole connection requires a more precise explanation of this presumptuous act. Others are of opinion that David had the people numbered that he might know the number of his warriors and arrange the order of military service; but, although this may certainly have been taken into account, since the number of those who were fit for war is given in v. 5 seq. and it was important to know the number before the army could be organised,—the census itself and the muster-rolls founded upon it were principally intended to facilitate the levy of the taxes which had been rendered necessary by the monarchical government, just as the census described in Ex. xxx. was taken for the sake of taxation. The free congregation had hitherto known nothing of fixed taxes for the state; but a monarchy could not exist without them. The people might cry out, as Samuel had foretold, when the king demanded taxes of them like the kings of other nations, and might see in this new scheme of David an encroachment upon the liberty of the people, an arbitrary alteration of ancient customs, an injustice, an oppression, a tyranny, which were unbecoming in a king of Israel. And it was quite in harmony with the customs of those times, that the guardians of the distinctive institutions of Israel, the prophets, should loudly condemn this new device, as Nathan had expressed disapprobation of David's plan of erecting a temple in the place of the moveable sanctuary (1 Chr. xvii.), and threatened David with punishment from God. David himself acknowledged that he had done wrong, and desisted from his undertaking (1 Chr. xxvii. 24). But the people were visited by a pestilence, in which was seen the chastising hand of God. V. 2. And David said *to Joab and to the prince of the people* (2 Sam.: *to Joab the captain of the host which was with him*); the original reading was probably *to Joab and to princes of the army who were with him* (cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 4). The rare word שׁוּט *to traverse* (in the Chronicles this root is only met with in the emphatic form in 2. xvi. 9) and פקד to *take a census*, which are used in 2 Sam., are exchanged by our historian for the more common לכו ספרו.—V. 3. In 2 Sam. we find this verse in its original extremely peculiar form as follows:

*and may Jehovah thy God add to the people as many as there are of them* (כהם *just as they*, the Israelites, *are*); the word is used here with reference to their number, and therefore with the meaning, as many as there are of them. Grammatically considered כהם is the accusative of the object governed by ויוסף, see the similar passages in Deut. i. 11; Ex. xi. 6; 2 Sam. xii. 8; and also the note on 2 Chr. ix. 11), *and as many as there are of them a hundred times, the eyes of the king seeing* (this increase of the people), *and my lord the king wherefore is he pleased with this thing?* Joab wishes the king to reign over twice as many subjects, or rather over a hundred times as many, and adds expressly his wish, that this increase should take place during the life time of David (thine eyes seeing) that he might rejoice in his numerous subjects. Hence, when he adds, "*wherefore is my lord pleased with this thing,*" and thus expresses his disapprobation of the measures adopted for the numbering of the people, he is not actuated by the desire to conceal from the king the large number of his subjects. The reading in our text is very different from that of Samuel; the important climax contained in the repetition of the words כהם וכהם is not expressed; the extremely peculiar and thoroughly suitable words ועיני אדני המלך ראות (and the eyes of my lord the king seeing) are altered, and in my opinion not intentionally but as the result of conjecture from an illegible text, for the letters of the words of our text הלא אדני המלך כלם לאדני לעבדים do not differ very considerably from those of the corresponding words in Samuel ועיני אדני המלך ראות ואדני המלך.—V. 4. The manner in which the census was taken is fully described in 2 Sam xxiv. 4—8, where it is also stated that Joab took nine months and twenty days to complete it. Our historian merely relates in a few words that the numbering was performed, and condenses into one verse the contents of five.—V. 5. The numbers given in the two texts differ; according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 9 there were 800,000 men in Israel and 500,000 in Judah capable of bearing arms, but in the Chronicles there are said to have been 1,100,000 in Israel and 470,000 in Judah. As the numbers are reckoned by thousands they are only approximative. The reliance to be placed upon them is still farther diminished by the dis-

crepancies. Moreover they do not appear to harmonise well with the statement contained in chap. xxvii. 1—15 of this book (that David appointed 24,000 men for service in each month under twelve different commanders), as this statement presupposes the existence of about 300,000 capable of bearing arms. But every attempt to reconcile the different accounts must necessarily rest upon arbitrary assumptions. All that can be inferred from the greatness of the numbers is, that the inhabitants of Palestine were extraordinarily numerous as early as David's time; we have most clear and credible testimony to the fact that in later times the population of this small country was incredibly large (see my Beiträge zur Gesch. der Israeliten p. 431 seq. *v. Raumer* Pal. ed. 2 p. 81).—V. 6. The account given in this verse, that Joab did not take any census in the case of the tribes of Levi and Benjamin, because the command of the king was an abomination to him, is not found in 2 Sam. *Gramberg* pretends that the historian invented it, for the purpose of showing that these tribes were not affected by the pestilence because they had not been numbered (according to verse 12 and 2 Sam. xxiv. 15 the pestilence raged throughout all the land, and Jerusalem alone was spared; nothing is said about Levi and Benjamin escaping), but such an assertion does not merit the elaborate answer which *Movers* has given to it (p. 305). There is nothing surprising in the statement contained in this verse. If the object of the census was to facilitate taxation, the sacerdotal tribe may have been exempted on account of their privileged position, just as we find them omitted in Num. i. 47, 48—54; and apart altogether from this, all that can be inferred from the fact that two tribes had not been numbered is, that the census was not complete, and this is expressly stated at chap. xxvii. 33 seq. From the account of the manner in which the census was taken (2 Sam. xxiv. 4—8) we may conclude that Judah and Benjamin were to have been numbered after the rest of the tribes; that after the census of Judah had been taken Joab had to go to Jerusalem; there he had most probably received orders from David, who had now changed his mind, to proceed no farther with the census, and thus it happened that Benjamin was not numbered along with the rest; cf. *Josephus*, Antiquities vii. 13. 1 *χωρὶς τῆς Βενιαμίτιδος φυλῆς, ἐξαριθμῆσαι γὰρ αὐτὴν οὐκ ἔφθασεν.*

We are not justified in regarding the account given in this verse as "an invention of the historian," nor does the omission of it from 2 Samuel disprove its credibility, for there are other notices in this narrative which are not found in Samuel, *e.g.* vv. 20, 23. V. 7. *And it was evil in the eyes of Jehovah concerning this thing*; the construction with עַל occurs in Gen. xxi. 12; in other cases the cause of the displeasure is placed after the verb without the preposition, *e.g.* 2 Sam. xi. 27; Gen. xxxviii. 10. The concluding words, *therefore he smote Israel*, anticipate what is narrated afterwards (v. 9 sqq.), and thus interrupt the course of the history. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 10 we find, instead of this clause, the very peculiar words "*and David's heart smote him*" (cf. 1 Sam. xxiv. 6). We can easily understand, how the words of the one clause could be altered into those of the other by any one who started with the assumption, that the passage contained a reference to the punishments inflicted by God. The first clause would probably be added to introduce and account for the second, as well as to connect it with the rest of the narrative. V. 8. *This thing*; an explanatory addition which there is no necessity to insert in the text of Samuel, as the sentence is complete without it. V. 9. *And the Lord spake to Gad*; as this is the first time that Gad is spoken of, the reading of Samuel, which indicates the change in the discourse *(and the word of Jehovah came to Gad)*, is preferable. *David's seer*; Heman is also called a prophet of the king (chap. xxv. 5), and therefore it must not be inferred from the title that Gad stood in such peculiar proximity to David, that the duty of reproving the king fell to him on account of his position more than to Nathan or any other of the prophets. V. 11. נֹטֶה (for the rarer word נֹטֵל in 2 Sam.) *I spread out above thee.* V. 11. *Thus saith Jehovah, choose thee*; an explanatory clause of which our historian is the author, as the use of the word קַבֵּל clearly shows. V. 12. The demand "*choose thee*" is followed by a somewhat different form of the question contained in Samuel. In the first query, *three years of famine? three* is the correct reading and not *seven*, which we find in the passage in Sam. (although the Septuagint reads *three* in that passage also.) To the *three* evils there correspond *three* years, *three* months, *three* days, and this beautiful agreement in the numbers is completely destroyed by the reading *seven*. In

the second question נָסֶה (2 Sam.) is the original reading; נספה probably crept into the text of the Chronicles through an oversight, from the illegibility of the text, for the particle Niphal does not suit the connection, since it can hardly mean *destruction*, and מפני (2 Sam. לפני) does not harmonise with this participle. *The sword of thine enemies overtaketh*; the word משגת is a very rare word (it only occurs once in the Old Testament, viz. Lev. xiv. 21), but it is a word which answers very well to רֹדְפֶךָ (2 Sam.), and רדף למשגת means *to pursue until one overtakes*. We conclude, therefore, that the original reading was והוא רדפך למשגת, but the first words have been altered in our text, from what cause we cannot tell. The third question appears to have been written originally in the form in which we find it in the text of the Chronicles, "*or the sword of Jehovah and pestilence for three days in thy land?*" The last words, "*the angel of Jehovah working destruction in the whole of the territory of Israel,*" might be regarded as an interpolation taken from v. 15, as there is no trace of this clause in Samuel; but they prepare the way for the sending of the angel, who is introduced in 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 quite suddenly and unexpectedly, and hence they are so necessary to elucidate the rest of the narrative, that they cannot well be dispensed with. In our opinion, therefore, they originally formed part of the text of Samuel also. *Now see* (more forcibly expressed in Samuel, *now mark and see* ועתה דע וראה); after ועתה the דע may easily have been dropt on account of the resemblance between the words. *What answer I shall bring to my sender*, to God who said to me: "*go and tell David, &c.*" (v. 10). V. 13. *Let me fall* (instead of the reading in Samuel, "let us fall now"); corresponding to the expression which follows, "*let me not fall.*" V. 14. For the sake of brevity the account of the duration of the pestilence and the extent of its ravages, which we find in Samuel, is omitted here. V. 15. וישלח האלהים מלאך (2 Sam. וישלח ידו מלאך); *Movers* (p. 91) argues in favour of the originality of the text of the Chronicles, but *Thenius* justly remarks that ידו is the most appropriate reading, since the counter-order "*draw back thine hand,*" points back to the commencement of the verse "*he stretched out his hand.*" The meaning is evidently this: as soon as the angel of God, who

had been commissioned to destroy the whole land by pestilence, approached the city of Jerusalem and stretched out his hand toward it, to smite the city with the sword which was drawn in his hand, the Lord repented of the evil and called to him "draw back thy hand." According to our text the Lord sent the angel with the express commission to destroy Jerusalem, and at the same moment gave him a counter-order, in which there certainly appears to be less propriety. Our reading *Elohim* has arisen from the fact that the letters of ידו ה were mistaken for יהוה, for which Elohim was then substituted as it frequently is in the Chronicles. *And at the time of the destroying*, at the moment in which the angel commenced the work of destruction, *Jehovah saw*; these words, which are intended to soften the harshness of the transition from the command to the countermand, are omitted from Samuel, where they would be superfluous. רַב has been regarded as an exclamation, *sufficit*, *hold*, *enough!* That this meaning suits the word cannot be proved by an appeal to Deut. vi. 1; in this connection it can only be an adjective or noun, and must be taken along with the verb *to destroy*, as the accusative of the object: *he said to the angel who was about to destroy a multitude*; the full reading is preserved in Sam. בעם רב, who was about to bring destruction upon a great multitude of people, cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 17. *Ornan*, in the Kethib of 2 Sam. xxiv. 16 אוֹרְנָה; in every other passage, with the exception of v. 19, the Keri is found אֲרַוְנָה (vv. 20, 21 sqq.). The latter form has not a Hebrew stamp, but Orna and Ornan are both Hebrew forms. For this very reason, however, the name Aravnah appears to point to an early tradition. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 23 this Aravnah is called *King*, and if we could attach much importance to the reading (the word is probably an interpolation) we should necessarily infer that he was the former king of Jebus, who retained his property, and continued to live there even after the conquest of the city by David. He is not called king anywhere else. On the hill to the north-east of Zion, subsequently the temple-hill, he had a threshing-floor, and according to v. 20 he was busy, threshing wheat there at this time (a somewhat different account is given in 2 Sam.).—V. 16. This verse does not form part of the narra-

tive in Samuel. As here David and the elders of the people are overpowered by the vision of the angel, and fall to the earth, so in v. 20 are Ornan and his four sons said to have concealed themselves, because they could not bear the sight. But we shall see that the words in question in v. 20 did not originally form part of the text; and this confirms the supposition to which we are led on comparing the verse with the account in Samuel, viz. that it was added by our historian to the original record. We have no further confirmation of this in the language employed; the expression מְכֻסִּים בשׂקים is only met with here (in every other case the Hithpael is employed, *cf.* 2 Kings xix. 1, 2, and the parallel passages in Isaiah, Jonah iii. 8); the rest of the words are nearly all of them so common that they might be found in every book of the Old Testament.—*And his sword drawn in his hand*, this expression occurs in Num. xxii. 23 in precisely the same form, and was probably taken from that passage.—In any case this account of the appearance of the angel is only an expansion of the corresponding account in Samuel, for there it is stated clearly enough that the threshing floor of Aravnah was set apart as a holy place, because the angel was standing near it, and was seen. According to 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, David saw the angel, and the context shows that the reference there is to a visible appearance of the angel.—V. 17. *Was it not I that commanded to number the people* (2 Sam. xxiv. 17, *when he saw the angel that smote the people)*; from a comparison of the words and letters of the Hebrew text of these two passages it is evident that the reading of the one has originated in that of the other; and it is pretty clear that from oversight and from an endeavour to restore a text, which had become illegible, the words of the verse before us have grown out of that in Samuel. Among the other variations the following is an important one: in 2 Sam. we find העויתי for הרע הרעותי. The original reading was probably ואנכי הָרֹעֶה העויתי, *and I the shepherd have acted perversely*, for the reading of our text could easily be formed from these words, and the reference to the shepherd would be quite appropriate as an antithesis to the sheep mentioned directly after.—*And on thy people not for a plague;* the order of these words is striking, we should expect them rather to run thus, "*on*

*me, and on my house, but not on the people for a plague,"* for this order seems requisite to give due prominence to the contrast intended. It is possible that in these words, of which no trace appears in Samuel, we may have two marginal notes, which have crept from the margin into the text: "*for a plague,*" was possibly written in the margin to explain, "*let thy hand be,*" and "*not on thy people*" may have been added as an explanation of the words "*on me and on my father's house.*"—V. 18. The angel of Jehovah told Gad *to say* (this is the only admissible explanation of לאמר here) *to David.* That the prophet received instructions from the angel is quite in keeping with the whole of the narrative. But it is only in books of a late period that we read of angels speaking to prophets in such a way as to form the medium of communication between God and the prophets addressed. In 2 Sam. Gad is described as going direct to David, and giving him the command to build an altar; but as the command came from the mouth of a prophet, David could not doubt that it was given in the name of God. The command itself is also given there in the words of a direct address.—V. 19. *At the saying;* or *according to the saying,* as we find it in Samuel. *Which he spake in the name of the Lord* (2 Sam. "*as the Lord commanded*"); the reading of the text is adopted here because the command is not described as coming direct from Jehovah.—V. 20. *And Ornan returned back;* it is difficult to discover to what these words refer. They do not suit the thread of the narrative, which is very distinctly preserved in Samuel, where we read that "when the king, who came with his retinue in a solemn procession from Mount Zion, ascended to the threshing floor of Ornan, and Ornan saw him approaching, he looked up from his work, and fixed his eyes upon the king," &c. In the passage before us וישב has grown out of וישקף, המלאך from המלך (the latter reading has been retained even by *Josephus,* vii. 13, 4, who in every other respect follows the text as we have it now) and our ארבעת בניו עמו from עבדיו עברים עליו. Probably *King* (2 Sam. xxiv. 20) was first changed into *angel;* this change rendered a further alteration of the text necessary, and the occurrence of the word angel in connexion with the name of Ornan may have suggested the thought that the passage contained a reference to the impres-

sion made upon him by the vision which he saw. In the Septuagint this passage is rendered : *καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν Ὀρνά, καὶ εἶδε τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τέσσαρας υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ μεθ' ἀχαβίν* according to another reading *καὶ τέσσαρες υἱοὶ κρυβόμενοι;* in the *Vulgate : porro Ornan cum suspexisset* (וישקף 2 Sam.) *et vidisset angelum quatuorque filii ejus cum eo, absconderunt se;* in both versions some remains of the original reading are to be found. The *Syriac* renders the passage thus: "And David saw that the angel, who was about to bring destruction upon the people, drew back his hand." The concluding words "*now Ornan was threshing wheat,*" contain a most satisfactory explanation of the reason why Ornan was in his threshing floor; they do not occur in Samuel, but in the Septuagint we find instead a remark at v. 15 to the effect that "the pestilence happened at the time of the wheat-harvest!" If we assume that Joab commenced the census in the quiet season of autumn, *i.e.* at the beginning of the civil year (Ex. xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22), the nine months and twenty days mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiv. 8, would extend to the time of the wheat harvest (*Ewald* Gesch. ii. 628); and hence the announcement that Ornan was engaged in threshing wheat is shown to have been already provided for by the previous account, and was probably taken by our historian from the original document which lay before him.—V. 21. On account of the present text of the previous verse it is stated here that, when David approached, Ornan looked and saw him; only the concluding words of the verse correspond to the last clause of 2 Sam. xxiv. 20.—V. 22. A comparison of this verse with 2 Sam. xxiv. 21 suggests the probability that the present reading of our text has been effected by Gen. xxiii. 9, where בכסף מלא and the verb נתן occur twice, just as in this verse, and in precisely the same order.—V. 23. *Let my lord the king do;* the original reading is *let him offer* (*Thenius*). After *the threshing instruments* there are added in Samuel the *instruments of the oxen,* meaning *the wooden yokes of the oxen.* Ornan offers to David the oxen, which were threshing the corn at the time, and also the threshing instruments and yokes, the latter because, being composed of small pieces of wood, they would facilitate the kindling of the fire. In order that everything which was requisite for the burnt-offering might be at hand, he offers him

also *the wheat as a gift*, of which no mention is made in Samuel. The words "*I give it all*" answer to the first clause of 2 Sam. xxiv. 23, "*all this did Araunah give*;" of the rest of that verse there is no trace in our text.—V. 24. *For I will not take what belongs to thee for Jehovah, and offer a burnt-offering obtained for nothing!* The infinitive העלות in this passage is very remarkable; the only possible way of explaining it would be to regard the clause as an incomplete exclamation, viz.: "and to offer a burnt-offering that cost nothing (*sc.* how could I do it!)" But if we compare this word with עלית and the rest of the clause in 2 Sam., it appears very probable that the original reading was: *I will not take what belongs to thee* (viz., the floor and land which are thy property) and will not offer, &c.—V. 25. After the words of David in the previous verse we expect to find that he purchased not only the ground but also *the cattle*, and this he is said to have done in Samuel, where he is described as giving fifty shekels of silver for the floor and the oxen. According to our text he paid *shekels of gold in weight six hundred.* To reconcile the two accounts ancient scholars (*e.g. Noldius* ad concord. Part. Not. 719) have expressed the opinion that the shekels of gold mentioned here are to be reckoned as silver ones, that they are called shekels of gold because they were paid in gold coin, whilst the amount actually paid was 600 shekels of silver, that gold was worth twelve times as much as silver, and therefore David paid fifty gold coins, which are the fifty pieces mentioned in Samuel. *R. Salomon* supposes that the twelve tribes contributed fifty shekels each, and thus the whole amount collected was 600 shekels. Other opinions equally marvellous have been expressed on this subject. The two accounts cannot be reconciled. (*Keil* arrives at a very different conclusion: he says (p. 326) "in 1 Chr. xxi. 25 it is stated that David gave to Ornan for the *place* (probably the hill, Mount Moriah) 600 shekels of gold. On the other hand in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24 we read that David bought the *threshing-floor and the oxen* for fifty shekels of silver. The very words of the two passages show that the authors were writing of different things, and therefore there is no reason to suppose that there is any error." Tr.)—*And he hearkened to him with fire from heaven upon the burnt offering, i.e.*, he shewed that he had determined to deliver the land from the pestilence, and also

that the sacrifice, which had been offered upon the newly erected altar and the new place of sacrifice, was acceptable to him, by sending fire from heaven, and thus kindling the wood upon the altar of burnt-offering, *cf.* 2 Kings i. 12; 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38; 2 Chr. vii. 1; and particularly Lev. ix. 24.—V. 27. A description in perfect keeping with the whole tenor of the narrative (*cf.* v. 16), corresponding to the words of 2 Sam. xxi. 25, "the plague was stayed from Israel."

Chap. xxi. 28—xxii. 19. David was not permitted to build the temple himself (cf. chap. xvii.); but the spot upon which it should afterwards be built, within the city which he had conquered and selected as the central-point of the Israelitish community, was set apart during his lifetime and consecrated by signs from God himself. He also made preparations for the building of the temple by collecting materials, so that Solomon was able at once to set about the erection of the new sanctuary, and to complete it during the first years of his reign.

Chap. xxi. 28—xxii. 1. The account of the numbering of the people, the pestilence and the appearance of the angel, is brought to a close in these verses. This conclusion is not to be found in the Book of Samuel, although it is evident, from the connection between the narrative and the whole of the history of David and Solomon in the Books of Samuel and Kings, that the only reason for its introduction is to show that the place upon which Solomon built the temple was holy ground even in David's time, and to answer the question why this spot in particular was selected for the sanctuary.—V. 28. *At that time, after the cessation of the pestilence, when David saw that Jehovah had heard him upon the threshing floor of the Jebusites, he sacrificed there.* According to the previous account, David offered the sacrifice during the pestilence, and the cessation of the pestilence is represented as the consequence of the sacrifice, which was accepted as well-pleasing to God (vv. 26, 27). It is to this that the expression "*he had heard*" in the verse before us refers; and therefore the words "*and he sacrificed,*" relate to the continuance of the practice of offering sacrifices at this place, which had been first used as a place of sacrifice during the pestilence. We might give this rendering to the clause: "*then David was in the habit of sacrificing there.*" —Vv. 29, 30. We have here a parenthesis, intended as a reply

to the question, how it was that David came to offer sacrifices at this new place of sacrifice, and on the new altar of burnt-offering, which he had erected there, notwithstanding the fact that the old Mosaic sanctuary, the central point of the worship of the Israelitish community ever since the time of Moses, was still standing upon the high places of Gibeon (cf. chap. xvi. 39 seq.). *David could not go before it* (the expression "*before it*" refers to the tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering which are mentioned just before; cf. chap. xvi. 4, 37: "before the ark," and xvi. 39: "before the tabernacle") *to seek God, i.e.*, to obtain the favour of God especially by the offering of sacrifices (cf. 2 Chr. i. 5 seq.), *for he had been afraid of the sword of the angel of Jehovah* (vv. 16, 27), not "ex terrore visionis angelicae infirmitatem corporis contraxerat" (*J. H. Michaelis*), but he had been affected, and, as it were, overcome by the distinct intimation from God that the place, where the angel had appeared, was a holy place, which God himself had consecrated for the offering of sacrifices, and therefore he did not dare to offer them elsewhere. —Chap. xxii. 1. Continuation of the narrative which was interrupted at v. 28 by the introduction of the parenthesis. The place, where the sanctuary was to be built, is described by David as *the house of God* (cf. Gen. xxviii. 17).

## 3. Chap. xxii. 2—19.

### DAVID'S PREPARATIONS FOR THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.

Chap. xxii. 2—5. *Collection of building-materials.—The strangers:* that is, those who were not Israelites by birth but lived in Israel as members of the community; their number in Solomon's time is given at 2 Chr. ii. 16, 17. According to 2 Chr. viii. 7—10 these foreigners consisted of descendants of the Canaanites, whom the Israelites had failed to exterminate when they conquered the land. (cf. 1 Kings v. 27—31, ix. 15—23.) —V. 3. מחברות, the Piel participle, *binding things;* according to 2 Chr. xxxiv. 11 they were pieces of wood used to connect the beams, but in this passage they are *iron brackets.*—V. 4. The *Zidonians and Tyrians* are classed together in the same way

in Ezra iii. 7. The meaning appears to be, that they brought to David an abundance of cedar wood as an article of commerce. In Solomon's time the Tyrians bound themselves by a formal contract to supply the cedar wood required (1 Kings v. 15—25.) —V. 5. *Young and tender;* the same expression occurs in chap. xxix. 1. We cannot draw any conclusion from these words as to the age of Solomon at this time, for Joshua is described in Ex. xxxiii. 11 as still a boy in relation to Moses, although it is evident from the chronological data given in the Pentateuch that he was more than forty years old. They show, however, the father's anxiety lest the powers of his youthful son should be inadequate to the great task which he left for him to perform; and hence in contrast with the son, who is young and tender, he says, "*the house, which is to be built for Jehovah, is very great to make* (on the Infinitive in this connexion see chap. v. 1, ix. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 2, on למעלה see chap. xiv. 2) *for a name, namely for renown and for glory with reference to all lands*" (chap. xiv. 17), (and in order that the disparity between the two may be softened down he resolves) "*I will make preparations for him.*"

Vv. 6—16. *In a solemn manner David gives to Solomon the commission to build the temple.*—V. 6. As the following address sounds like the last charge of a dying father, and as it strongly recals to mind, at least in some of the expressions, the address contained in 1 Kings ii. 2—9, which is said in v. 1 to have been delivered by David a short time before his death, and as reference is made to his death in the previous verse, the meaning of the verse before us evidently is, that David called Solomon to him a short time before his decease, that he might give him instructions with reference to the building of the temple.—V. 7. According to the accents the reading of the *Keri* should be adopted, and in this case the address would begin with the vocative *my son!* But the commencement of the address is distinctly marked by the first person pronoun, and therefore the Kethib (*his son*) must be retained and the accents changed so as to read: *he said to Solomon his son. I, it was in my heart,* in other words I intended; we find almost exactly the same expression in chap. xxviii. 2, 2 Chr. vi. 7, 8, and many other passages in the second Book of Chronicles i. 11, ix. 1, xxiv. 4, xxix. 10, but it very rarely occurs in the other books of the Old Testament, *e.g.*, 1 Kings

viii. 17 seq.—The verse points back to chap. xvii. 1 seq.—V. 8. According to the will of God the building of the temple was not to be entrusted to the warlike king David, but to his son, who was to be permitted to live at peace. This historical fact is again referred to in chap. xxviii. 3, and 1 Kings v. 17, though not in the same terms as in this verse. It is recorded here in the form of a command, which was given by God to David ("And the word of the Lord came to me"). We must bear in mind that in Nathan's address (chap. xvii. 4—14) the prosperous wars of David are mentioned, but it is not stated that these wars unfitted him to build the temple. *Before me* thou hast shed much blood upon the earth, that is, so that I looked upon it.—V. 9. *A son will be born to thee;* the participle is also used in this sense after the exclamation *behold!* in 1 Kings xiii. 2. Compare v. 19 of this chapter.—*A man of rest,* like Jer. li. 59 and Ps. xxiii. 2: "*waters of rest,*" must denote the man who procures rest for others; from the antithesis *a man of war* (1 Chr. xxviii. 3) and the context of this passage, the word *menochah* evidently means *rest,* and Solomon is called *a man of rest,* because he was to enjoy the blessings of peace.—*And I will give him rest,* cf. 1 Kings v. 18.—שְׁלֹמֹה (*Solomon*)*;* according to this passage the name has the same meaning as *Friederich,* but from the relation in which it stands to the peace enjoyed by the land during his reign, we are not to infer that the name was first given to Solomon in consequence of the peace which had been established in his days. The writer regards it as a most significant omen. The other name Jedidiah was given to Solomon by Nathan, and is described in 2 Sam. xii. 24 seq. as a second and superior name, which he received in addition to the name of Solomon *on account of Jehovah, i.e.,* to express the relation in which he was to stand to Jehovah. Jedidiah was a new name expressly formed for this purpose and is not met with elsewhere, whilst Shelomo does not appear to have been an unusual name. We find names in other passages which closely resembled it, *e.g., Shelomi,* Num. xxxiv. 27, *Shelomith,* Lev. xxiv. 11; 1 Chr. iii. 19, xxvi. 25; 2 Chr. xi. 20 (compare the account of the peace in Solomon's days at 1 Kings v. 4 seq.).—V. 10. A free rehearsal of the promises contained in Nathan's address (chap. xvii. 12, 13).—V. 11. *Jehovah be with thee;* vv. 16, 18.—V. 12.

*Wisdom and understanding* (2 Chr. ii. 11); David's wish reminds us of the account of Solomon's dream in 1 Kings iii. 5—15. ולשמר, (the infinitive with *lamed*, a construction peculiar to the author of the Chronicles,) *to keep!* that is, thou must keep, cf. v. 5.—V. 13. Both the expression "*take heed to do*" and the juxtaposition of the words, "the *statutes and judgments*," remind us of Deut. xi. 32, iv. 1, v. 1, vii. 4, &c. *Be strong and of good courage, fear not*, cf. Deut. xxxi. 6, and Josh. i. 7. "*Be not dismayed*" in connection with "*fear not*" occurs also in Deut. i. 21, xxxi. 8.—V. 14. בעניי not *in my poverty*, but *by my strenuous labour*, according to Gen. xxxi. 42; see the precisely similar expression in chap. xxix. 2, *I have prepared with all my might.* The enormous amounts given here, 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver, are not found anywhere else even in the Book of Chronicles, for in chap. xxix. 4, David is said to have contributed of his own property 3000 talents of gold and 7000 talents of silver, whilst the freewill offerings of the Israelitish princes amounted to 5000 talents of gold, 10,000 dariks and 10,000 talents of silver, immense sums no doubt, but sums which must be called small in comparison with those named in the verse before us. As a proof of the extraordinary wealth of Solomon, it is stated in 1 Kings x. 14 that his income had reached 666 talents of gold a year, *i.e.*, about twenty million thalers (three million pounds sterling, *Thenius*); the queen of Sheba presented Solomon with 120 talents of gold (1 Kings x. 10; 2 Chr. ix. 9); King Hiram gave him the same sum (1 Kings ix. 14), and according to the context of the account in the Books of Kings we are to regard this as an extraordinarily large amount. And yet in the verse before us we read of 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver, a sum almost sufficient to pay the debts of all the states of Europe.[1] It is out of the question to take these numbers in their strict literality. It may originally have been intended as nothing more than a very loose expression with the meaning *very much, an extraordinary amount:* a kind of circumlocution, which may still be sometimes heard in the mouths of persons, who have not reflected much upon the worth and import of

[1] This is an exaggeration, for according to the author's own computation just before, it would fall very far short of paying the national debt of Great Britain alone.—Tr.

numbers and, for that very reason, talk without hesitation of thousands and hundreds of thousands. This opinion is confirmed by v. 16, where it is expressly stated that the gold and silver could not be numbered. Earlier expositors have either regarded the numbers, as we find them here, as in literal accordance with fact (*undecumque autem*, says *Colovius*, *David tantam compararit summam*—3300 *Ioachimicorum millionum*—*a litera textus ob nostram ignorantiam adeo discedendum non est, ut potius mirari ac venerari oporteat benedictionem divinam hujus opilionis, quae tam immensos thesauros ipsi, ad regium thronum evecto conciliarit, etc. J. H. Michaelis*), or they have tried by arbitrary assumptions to reduce the amount; the latter is the method adopted even by *Keil*, p. 334 sqq.—(It may be well to supply the explanation suggested by *Keil* to which the author refers. He says: "according to 1 Chr. xxii. 14 David gives 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver for the building of the temple, and according to chap. xxix. 4 he contributes beside this 3000 talents of gold and 7000 talents of silver, to which the nobles of the kingdom add 5000 talents of gold, 10,000 dariks, 10,000 talents of silver, and a large quantity of brass and iron. The last two statements can hardly be called in question, when we consider the opportunities enjoyed by David for amassing incalculable treasures. He conquered the Edomites, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Syrians, and the powerful king of Nesibis, whose officers had golden shields (2 Sam. viii. 7). No one will deny that by these numerous wars David and the elders of his kingdom must have been able to accumulate immense wealth. Beside this the Israelitish officers under Moses took from the Midianites 16,750 shekels of gold in chains, bracelets, rings, and other ornaments, in addition to the booty that was carried off by the common soldiers (Num. xxxi. 50—53), and the weight of the rings alone, which Gideon received as a share of the plunder taken from the Ishmaelites, was 1700 shekels (Judg. viii. 26). It is true that, according to 2 Sam. viii. 11 sqq., David placed all the gold and silver, that had been taken from the tribes just named, in the treasury of the temple; but, notwithstanding this, great wealth must have flowed into his own private treasures from the kings, who either sent him valuable presents as a friend, or paid tribute as vassals. If Solomon re-

ceived 660 talents of gold annually from the allied kings and governors of the provinces (1 Kings x. 14 seq.; 2 Chr. ix. 13 seq.), besides the income derived from commerce, David, who had the same revenue in the latter part of his reign, with the exception of that derived from the trade with Ophir, which brought Solomon his extraordinary wealth, might very well possess 3000 talents of gold in his private treasury. And the treasury of the temple must have been considerably enriched by the extraordinary amount of booty. But the statement seems almost to reach the incredible. Yet not only earlier theologians, but modern expositors also (*e.g. Dereser*) have supported the historical character of the first numbers (viz., the amount in the temple-treasury); and, in fact, if the numbers in every other instance were free from error, we could and must admit their correctness in this instance also, because *every calculation, that can be based upon our money, is uncertain.* The only clue which we possess is the assertion of *Josephus* (Ant. iii. 8—2), that a shekel was equal to four Attic drachms. But there was an interval of a thousand years between Josephus and David, and, with the frequent changes in the government, there must have been great alterations in the weights and measures of the Jews. Moreover, there are many proofs that the talent was much smaller in ancient times (cf. *Michaelis de siclo ante exil. Babyl.* and his *suppl. ad lexx. hebr.* p. 364 sqq.) To this must be added the uncertainty as to the shekels by which the talents were calculated, whether they were shekels of the sanctuary or royal shekels. If, for example, the amount was computed according to the latter (and this is a possible thing), *J. D. Michaelis* reckons that it would be worth 540 million thalers (81 million pounds sterling). But even this sum could be considerably reduced, for the gold was not so fine as our sterling gold; moreover, we are not acquainted with the relative value of gold and silver in ancient times. Again this gold had not all been collected by David, but the amount named included all that had been brought into the treasury of the sanctuary by Samuel, Saul, Abner, and Joab; for, according to 1 Chr. xxvi. 28, the whole of this went into the temple-fund. We may even add still earlier contributions to the sanctuary, for there is nothing to lead to the conclusion that the treasury of the tabernacle had ever been plundered by enemies.

Whoever ponders all these reasons, will at least withhold his decision." *Keil* Chronik. p. 334—336).—The explanatory clause כי לרב היה could only mean, in the mouth of David: *for* (when an attempt was made to weigh it) *it was* lying *in a mass*, so that it was necessary to give up all thought of ascertaining the weight; compare the more simple expression in v. 3. *And thou mayest add thereto;* see 2 Chr. ii. "how Solomon collected stores and wood for the building of the temple." V. 15. This verse contains a reference to v. 2, where the stonemasons are spoken of, and to v. 4, which treats of the Zidonians and Tyrians who brought the cedar wood (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 7). *All manner of cunning men;* these skilful mechanics, whom David had secured for the building of Solomon's temple, are referred to in 2 Chr. ii. 6. V. 16. *Arise and be doing;* a precisely similar expression is also found in Ezra x. 4.

Vv. 17—19. *David commands the princes of Israel to assist in the building of the temple.* V. 17. *All the princes of Israel;* chap. xxiii. 2, xxviii. 1. V. 18. The omission of any intimation that the words in v. 18 seq. were spoken by David himself is of little consequence, for on the very first glance they may be recognised as David's words. Still there is something peculiar in this abrupt introduction of the words of another. We find a similar example in chap. xxiii. 4 seq. *For he hath given the inhabitants into my hand;* cf. Josh. ii. 24. *And the land is subdued;* see Josh. xviii. 1, Num. xxxii. 22, 29, where the expressions *before Jehovah*, and *before you*, or *before them*, viz. his people, also occur. V. 19. *To seek Jehovah;* the regular construction with the accusative without *lamed* is also met with in the Chronicles, *e.g.* Bk. 1. xxi. 30; Bk. 2. xvi. 12. *The ark of the covenant of Jehovah;* the ark was kept in a tent on Mount Zion during the reign of David (chap. xv. 1, 1 Chr. v. 2). To bring the ark . . . *into the house;* the ל before בית is here again a sign of the accusative as in chap. xxv. 26; Neh. x. 35 seq. הנבנה, into the house *that is to be built;* cf. v. 9.

## 8. Chap. xxiii.—xxvi.

**DAVID MAKES SOLOMON KING. DIVISION OF THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES INTO CLASSES, AND APPOINTMENT OF THEIR DUTIES.**

1. Chap. xxiii. 1. שָׂבַע יָמִם; in other cases we find the adjective שְׂבַע יָמִים, or שְׂבַע alone in the same sense, the former in Gen. xxxv. 29, and Job xlii. 17, the latter in Gen. xxv. 8. In this instance we have the third person perfect of Kal followed by a noun in the accusative. From this it follows that זָקֵן must also be the third person perfect of the verb. *He made Solomon his son king over Israel ;* this is not a passing remark to be taken up again at a future time (*e.g.* at chap. xxix. 22), but an independent statement, which is complete in itself, and forms the commencement of the account of the arrangements made by David during the last days of his life. In these few words we have the substance of the narrative contained in 1 Kings i., which could not properly be inserted at length in the Book of Chronicles, as it is closely connected with the account of the family affairs of David related in the Books of Samuel and Kings, and the plan of our historian led him to avoid such topics altogether.

2. Chap. xxiii. 2—xxvi. *a.* The number of the Levites and their occupations, chap. xxiii. 2—5. *b.* The fathers'-houses of the Levites, chap. xxiii. 6—23, with supplementary remarks, vv. 24—33. *c.* The twenty-four priestly classes, chap. xxiv. 1—19. *d.* The leaders of the classes of the Levites, chap. xxiv. 20—31. *e.* The twenty-four classes of singers, chap. xxv. *f.* The classes of the doorkeepers, chap. xxvi. 1—19. *g.* The managers of the treasures of the sanctuary, chap. xxvi. 20—28. *h.* Officers appointed for external affairs, chap. xxvi. 29—32.

(*a.*) Chap. xxiii. 2—5.—V. 2. Then David *assembled* (*sc.* in the last days of his life *cf.* chap. xxvi. 31), *all the princes of Israel; cf.* chap. xxii. 17. In chap. xxv. 1 we read that the

*princes of the host* assisted David in arranging the singers. The meaning is that David made the arrangements, which are afterwards described, in a solemn assembly of the princes (*i.e.* the representatives of the lay-tribes) and of the priests and Levites. According to other passages the *princes of thousands* stood immediately by the side of David (chap. xiii. 1), and the *elders of Israel* are mentioned in connection with them (chap. xv. 25).—V 3. *From thirty years and upwards;* just as, according to Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 39 sqq., the census was taken of all Levites between the ages of thirty and fifty for the service of the sanctuary (according to Num. viii. 23—26 every Levite of twenty-five years old and upward was to take his turn in the service of the tabernacle), so here the census, taken by David towards the close of his life, embraced all the Levites who were thirty years old and upward. The relation, in which this notice stands to the account contained in v. 24 of this chapter, we shall reserve for discussion when we come to that verse. "*By their polls, man by man:*" the second expression defines the first so as to prove that women and children were not included.—V. 4 seq. As soon as the number had been determined (38,000), David spoke (that these verses contain an address by David is evident from the word עָשִׂיתִי, in v. 5; the abrupt introduction of David's words is not more remarkable in this passage than in chap. xxii. 18 seq.), for the purpose of decreeing what number of Levites should be appointed to the different offices.—*Twenty-four thousand* of them were set apart *to conduct the work of the house of Jehovah* (for a more precise explanation of this expression see v. 28—32, and chap. ix. 13): among the different departments of this work were (1) *the service of the holy of holies,* which was committed to the priests (chap. vi. 49), who were divided into twenty-four classes, as described immediately afterwards at chap. xxiv.; (2) the "*work of the service,*" which is said in chap. ix. 19 to have been committed to the *four thousand doorkeepers;* (3) the "*outward business*" mentioned in chap. xxvi. 29, which was allotted to the *six thousand scribes and judges;* (4) *the work of the singers* (chap. xxv. 1), of the four thousand singers, *who praise Jehovah with the instruments, which I have made for praising;* cf. Nehem. xii. 36, the instruments of David the man of God, by which the stringed instruments especially are meant, 2 Ch. xxix.

26; there is also a passage in Amos (vi. 5) in which David is spoken of as the inventor of musical instruments.

*(b.)* Chap. xxiii. 6—23. *The twenty-four fathers'-houses of the Levites.* וַיֵּחָלְקֵם, this pointing is also found in chap. xxiv. 3 (where, however, more accurate editions, for example that of *R. Norzi*, have וַיֶּחָלְקֵם); besides these there are MSS. and editions in which we find the ordinary Piel וַיְחַלְּקֵם and a rare but intelligible form of the imperfect Kal וַיַּחָלְקֵם (*cf. J. H. Michaelis* not. crit.). The last form is accredited by *R. D. Kimchi*, in chap. xxiv. 3, and he expressly states that the regular form answers to it; *cf. R. Norzi* on this passage. We are led by such passages as chap. xxiv. 4, 5; 2 Chr. xxiii. 18 (xxviii. 21) Nehem. ix. 22 to expect a Kal. The Niphal, which very seldom occurs, would have to be rendered *distribuit sibi*, a rendering which would cause some difficulty; still we might bring forward the form הֵעָשׂוֹתוֹ, Ezek. xliii. 18, in explanation of the use of the Niphal in the word וַיֶּחָלְקֵם. We must necessarily pronounce it a Piel (in the Chronicles it occurs nowhere but in chap. xvi. 3) if the pointing וַיְּחָלְקֵם (= וַיְּחַלְּקֵם) were supported by good MSS., but this is not the case. This pointing appears to us to have originated in a very simple conjecture, and in the wish to substitute a similar expression for the traditional reading וַיֶּחָלְקֵם. For this reason we are unable to subscribe to the opinion of *Gesenius* (thes. p. 483) and *Ewald* (Lehrb. 64 c.), that the Piel was the form originally intended. וַיֶּחָלְקֵם, which is the pointing that must be adopted both here and in chap. xxiv. 3, admits of explanation as a Kal; in consequence of the suffix the two consonants *Koph* and *Lamed* lose their vowel, and the Cheth before these two vowelless consonants, which as a Guttural was previously written with Patach, now takes a Kametz. In other cases indeed the vowel, which has been dropt, reappears in an earlier part of the word, as for example תָּעָבְדֵם from תַעֲבֹד Ex. xx. 5, but as the general laws of inflexion are not opposed to the insertion of the Kametz, and there are cases in which it is so inserted, *e.g.* in יִשְׁחָטוּם from יִשְׁחֲטוּ 2 Kings x. 14, we need not hesitate to assume that a Kametz has been introduced here, and

that the Patach under the Yod has been consequently changed into Seghol, according to a well known rule. There can be no doubt that *D. Kimchi* had this explanation of the pointing in his mind, when starting from the regular form וַיַּחַלְּקֵם (or וַיְּחַלְּקֵם) he attributed the change of the Patach under the Yod into Seghol to the influence of the following Kametz.—מחלקות is the second Accusative: *into sections according to the sons of Levi, Gershon, Kohath and Merari, i.e.* according to the three great families into which the tribe of Levi had been from time immemorial divided, *cf.* chap. v. 27, vi. 1.—After the announcement in v. 5, and the foregoing verses, we expect an account of the different sections into which the Levites were divided; but according to the statement in *v.* 24, which forms an introduction to the supplementary remarks in vv. 24—32, the sons of Levi are here mentioned first according to their fathers'-houses, and in fact only such of the fathers'-houses are named as performed the work connected with the service of the house of Jehovah, that is to say the 24,000 mentioned in v. 4; the singers, doorkeepers, scribes and judges are noticed afterwards. The twenty-four thousand alone are described here, as we may see from the fact that many of the names which occur in this passage are mentioned again in chap. xxiv. 20—31, where we have a list of the heads of the houses of these Levites, and in chap. xxvi. 20—28, where the management of the treasures of the house of God, which was committed to certain individuals among them, is treated of, whereas we find totally different names in the account of the twenty-four classes of singers (chap. xxv. 1—31), of the doorkeepers (chap. xxvi. 1—19), and of the scribes and judges (chap. xxvi. 29—32). As the fathers'-houses of the priests coincide with the twenty-four classes into which they were divided (chap. xxiv. 1—19), so may we conclude that the fathers'-houses of those Levites, who cast lots in the same manner as their brethren the priests, coincided with the classes. We are not informed in the Book of Chronicles into how many classes these Levites were divided; but as they cast the lots precisely in the same manner as the priests, we may safely assume that they were also divided into twenty-four classes, especially as we learn from v. 25 that the singers also formed twenty-four classes. When

Josephus expressly says (Ant. 7, 14, 7) that David divided these Levites into twenty-four classes, he certainly catches the meaning of the announcement in chap. xxiv. 31. It will therefore be necessary to examine the verses before us for the purpose of seeing whether there are twenty-four fathers'-houses mentioned in them. In replying to this question we shall compare chap. xxiv. 20—31, and xxvi. 20—28, as very many of the names which occur in the passage before us are repeated there.

Vv. 7—11. *Gershon.* The two leading branches of Gershon were *Laadan* and *Shimei.* V. 8. The principal branch *Laadan* was first divided into three fathers'-houses, the head *Jehiel*, *Zetham*, and *Joel.*—V. 9. In the fathers'-house of Laadan there were also included three sons of Shimei, not the Shimei mentioned in *v.* 7, whose sons are given in *v.* 10, but those of another Shimei belonging to the family of Laadan. The three fathers'-houses of Shimei were *Shelomith* (Keri) or *Shelomoth* (Kethib), *Chaziel* and *Haran.* The note, "these are the heads of the fathers'-houses of Laadan," states most distinctly, that there were 3 × 3 fathers'-houses belonging to Laadan.—V. 10. Now first do we come to the fathers'-houses of the Shimei, who is mentioned in v. 7 by the side of Laadan. There were three fathers'-houses belonging to him; these houses were founded by four sons, *Jochath*, *Zina*, or *Ziza* (v. 11), *Jeush* and *Beriah*, the last two forming *one father's-house and one official class* (chap. xxiv. 3, 2 Chr. xvii. 14) on account of the paucity of their numbers.—Thus Gershon had nine fathers'-houses, six of them the fathers'-houses of Laadan and three the fathers'-houses of Shimei.

Vv. 12—20. *Kohath.*—V. 12. The four leading branches of Kohath are given in precisely the same way in chap. v. 28, vi. 3; Ex. vi. 18, &c.—V. 13. Of the sons of *Amram*, Aaron is not reckoned here, *for he was set apart, to consecrate him as most holy* (lit. *holy of holies*, a term which is nowhere else applied to Aaron), *he and his sons for ever* (that they might discharge the priestly duties) *to serve him and to bless his name;* this duty, however, was not confined to them, but belonged to the other Levites also, Deut. x. 8. Aaron's sons form the subject of chap. xxv. 1—19. —V. 14. Hence only such of the descendants of Amram are noticed here, as belonged to the line of his son Moses, for *Moses the man of God* (Deut. xxxiii. 1 and elsewhere) *his sons are*

*named according to the tribe of Levi,* they were reckoned among the Levites generally and did not belong to that portion of Levi to which the priestly duties were assigned.—V. 15. The birth of *Gershom* is mentioned in Ex. ii. 22: *Gershom* and *Eliezer* are spoken of Ex. xviii. 3 seq.—V. 16. *Sons* (although only one name follows), *Shebuel the head;* from the remark made in v. 17 we may conclude that Gershom had other sons, but they were reckoned as part of the fathers'-house of Gershom, and therefore are not named.—V. 17. Eliezer had only one son, *Rechabiah,* whose fathers'-house included *very many.* Thus the descendants of Amram, who were not priests, consisted of two fathers'-houses: Shebuel and Rechabiah.—V. 18. The sons of *Izhar* formed *one* fathers'-house *Shelomith* (Shelomoth, chap. xxiv. 22). V. 19. *Chebron* consisted of four fathers'-houses, the names of which occur again in the same order at chap. xxiv. 23.—V. 20. *Uzziel* contained two fathers'-houses, which are mentioned again in the same way at chap. xxiv. 24 seq. Thus Kohath was also the founder of nine Levitical fathers'-houses, besides the priests, and these nine (a point worthy of attention) are mentioned again by the same names at chap. xxiv. 20—25.

Vv. 21—23. *Merari.* The two sons *Machli* and *Mushi* are described in chap. vi. 4, Ex. vi. 19, and Num. iii. 33, as the two leading branches of Merari. But in chap. xxiv. 26 seq. we find the names of the sons of *Jaaziah the son of Merari,* a third leading branch who were the founders of three fathers'-houses, *Shoham, Zakkur,* and *Ibri.* According to all that precedes we are justified in assuming that there is a perfect harmony between the list of Merari's descendants given here and that contained in chap. xxiv. 26—31, and can therefore entertain no doubt that Jaaziah and his three sons were originally mentioned in the list before us. As two sons only, Machli and Mushi, are noticed in other passages, we can easily explain how the third name came to be omitted here, whilst there is no way in which we could explain a subsequent and arbitrary interpolation of the name.—V. 22. Eleazar had no sons; his daughters were married to the sons of Kish, *their brethren, i.e.,* their blood relations, according to the law (Num. xxxvi. 6—9). *Kish* then had sons; they are not named here, but are noticed in chap. xxiv. 29: "*the sons of Kish Jerahmeel.*"—V. 23. The sons of Mushi are also named in

chap. xxiv. 30. In itself it is not strange, that there should be another Machli among them, for the same names occur in other instances among relations; but it is strange that the two names Mushi and Machli follow closely the one upon the other, and it may reasonably be conjectured that Machli was placed in the text by mistake, and that this error led to the addition of the number *three*, which we do not find in chap. xxiv. 30. If then we assume that Machli was not originally in the text, the leading branch of Merari consisted of six fathers'-houses: *Shoham*, *Zakkur*, *Ibri*, *Kish-Jerahmeel*, *Eder*, *Jeremoth*. Thus Gershom was the founder of sixty-nine fathers'-houses, Kohath of nine, Merari of six, in all *twenty-four*.

Vv. 24—32. *Supplementary remarks.*—V. 24. *These* (the persons just named) *are the sons of Levi according to their fathers'-houses, the heads of the fathers'-houses according as they were numbered* (Num. i. 21 sqq.; Ex. xxx. 14), *in a list of their names* (Num. i. 18, chap. iii. 43) *according to their heads, performing the work* (עֹשֵׂה הַמְּלָאכָה, as in 2 Chr. xxiv. 12, xxxiv. 10, 13, Ezra iii. 9, Nehem. ii. 16 (cf. 2 Chr. xi. 1), is hardly a Singular, but another mode of writing the ordinary plural עֹשֵׂי, which occurs by the side of עוֹשֵׂה in 2 Chr. xxiv. 13 (cf. 12), xxxiv. 17 (cf. 10), Nehem. xi. 12, xiii. 10, and evidently has the same signification) *for the service of the house of Jehovah from* (those who were) *twenty years old and upwards.* According to this the Levites who were twenty years old were to take their share of the duties, whereas it was stated at *v.* 3, that the Levites were numbered off for service from their thirtieth year. To reconcile these statements, *Kimchi* and some of the earlier Christian expositors (*e.g.*, *J. H. Michaelis*) assumed that David first took the census according to the law (Num. iv. 3, 23, 30) including only such as were thirty years of age, but that when he perceived that even those who were only twenty years old were able to perform the duties of the sanctuary, which were considerably lightened now that it was no longer moveable, he included in the second census, which was taken, according to v. 27, towards the close of his life, all those who were twenty years of age. We cannot subscribe to this opinion. For (1) the census of the Levites of thirty years of age gave 38,000 (v. 3); these 38,000 were

appointed and no more; it is nowhere stated that this number did not suffice, or that the arrangements founded upon it (vv. 4, 5) were not permanently maintained; (2) the historian shows clearly enough, that he is about to make a statement here which differs from the account he had previously given, for in v. 25 seq. he mentions the reason why David was induced to depart from the ancient legal prescription with reference to the numbering of those who were above thirty years of age, and in v. 27 he expressly points out the source from which he derived this last account. Hence the attempts to bring the two into harmony cannot be sustained, for the evident intention of the author was to communicate two different accounts, according to the one of which the Levites in David's time were numbered from their thirtieth year, whilst according to the other David had already introduced the plan, which was subsequently followed (2 Chr. xxxi. 17; Ezra ii. 8), of appointing the Levites to their duties at their twentieth year.—V. 25 seq. Jehovah *has given rest to his people*, so that they no longer need to wander from one place to another with the dwelling place of Jehovah (chap. xvii. 5), and the consequence of this is, that *he dwells in Jerusalem for ever, and the Levites also have no longer to carry the dwelling and all its vessels for the service thereof* (Num. iii. 7, 8; and iv. 4—33); we may easily supply the conclusion at which these words of David point, viz. since the hard labour is at an end, those who are twenty years old may take part in the service. *No longer to carry*; cf. 2 Chr. v. 11, xxxv. 15.—V. 27. Not *according to the last commands of David* (*J. H. Michaelis*), but *in the last memorials of David*, in which there is a reference to a portion of some historical work, as chap. xxix. 29 clearly shows. המה מספר, *are the number* (*i.e.*, the persons numbered) *of the sons of Levi from their twentieth year*.—V. 28. *For their post was* (no longer to carry the dwelling place and its sacred vessels, but) *by the side of Aaron*.—על החצרות *over the forecourts*. לכל קדש, the *lamed* of indirect connection after the construct state, (see on the other hand 2 Chr. xxx. 19).—V. 29. Instead of the preposition *al* we find *lamed* in the subsequent portion of the narrative. And *over all the measures and sizes*, which were kept by the Levites; the meal and oil and wine had all to be offered in certain definite quantities in connection with the burnt offerings

(cf. Ex. xxix. 40).—V. 30. *To thank and to praise;* there is nothing to show that these words refer to the 4000 Levites, who were set apart to praise Jehovah with instruments, nor can it be proved by a reference to chap. xxv. 3, where the words are used in a different connexion. The 24,000 Levites will assuredly not have discharged their duties like dumb servants in the sanctuary. —V. 31. ולכל before the Infinitive, which is closely connected with the following substantive: *and for the whole of the sacrificing of burnt offerings.—In the number* (2 Sam. ii. 15); *i.e.*, according to the number appointed in the law concerning the festivals (Num. xxviii.). *Continually;* this does not refer to the word *mishpat* which immediately precedes it, but to the *burnt-offerings for Jehovah,* which were *continual,* because they had to be always offered again when the appointed days came round, compare Num. xxviii. 6, &c., "*a continual burnt offering.*"— V. 32. With the word ושמרו the construction is altered and a new commencement made, for after לעמד in v. 30 the regular order would require לִשְׁמֹר or וְיִשְׁמְרוּ. As a conclusion, the whole of the service of the Levites is briefly described in the well-known words from Num. xviii. 3 sqq.: and *so shall they keep the charge of the tabernacle* (Num. xviii. 4; it followed as a matter of course that this law also referred to the temple about to be built, which was to take the place of the tabernacle) *and the charge of the holy place* (Num. xviii. 5), *and the charge of the sons of Aaron* (cf. Num. xviii. 3, "they shall keep thy charge").

(c) Chap. xxiv. 1—19. *The twenty-four priestly classes.*—V. 1. The brief expression, "*and according to the sons of Aaron their classes,*" is perfectly intelligible if we compare it with chap. xxiii. 6. The four *sons of Aaron;* see chap. v. 29; Ex. vi. 23.—V. 2. Compare Lev. x. 1 seq. and Num. iii. 4, in which we find almost exactly the same words as in the verse before us.—V. 3. *And distributed them,* cf. chap. xxiii. 6. On "Ahimelek ben Abiathar (v. 6) of the line of Ithamar by the tribe of Zadok of the line of Eleazar" compare chap. xviii. 16. *According to their official classes* (chap. xxiii. 11) *in their service.*—V. 4. *More numerous with regard to the heads of the men, i.e.,* not with regard to the number of men's heads (see chap. xxiii. 3) but with regard to the leaders of the men when divided into fathers'-

houses (see chap. xxvi. 12 seq.). Still the fact that there was a large number of fathers'-houses and of their heads or presidents was no doubt caused by the excess in the number of priests belonging to the family of Eleazar. *And* (David, Zadok, and Ahimelek) *divided them: for the sons of Eleazar's heads of fathers'-houses sixteen, and for the sons of Ithamar's (heads) of fathers'-houses eight.* V. 5. *These with those;* probably in such a manner that Eleazar's sixteen fathers'-houses kept by themselves and Ithamar's fathers'-houses by themselves, and that then they drew the lots alternately according to the rule described in v. 6. The lots were drawn by the fathers'-houses of the two, because from time immemorial there had been in both families *holy princes* (Is. xliii. 28, equivalent to "the princes of the priests," 2 Chr. xxxvi. 14 cf. Jer. lii. 24) and *princes of God* (*Sept.* ἄρχοντες κυρίου, an expression only met with here.) V. 6. *And before the heads of the fathers'-houses of the priests and of the rest of the Levites,* אחד אחז; this expression and the words ואחז אחז, which follow immediately after, are found in nearly all the MSS., for very few have ואחד אחז, though some expositors (*e.g. Cappellus, Grotius,* and even *Gesenius,* thes. p. 68) pronounce this the original reading. For an explanation of the word אחז we may refer to Num. xxxi. 30, 47; it denotes that which is taken out of a larger number, and according to the context in this case taken out by lot. We may, therefore, render the word a lot, *i.e.* that which is determined by lottery, and translate the passage accordingly: *a single father's-house was a lot for Eleazar, and* (a single father's house) *a lot, a lot for Ithamar.* The order of the sixteen fathers'-houses of Eleazar, and of the eight of Ithamar, was to be decided by lot, and the plan to be adopted was not for all the fathers'-houses of Eleazar to draw first, and then those of Ithamar, but the order of *these and those* was to be fixed *at the same time,* v. 5. Now the names of the twenty-four fathers'-houses might have been put into one urn, but in order to secure the desired alternation of the houses of the two families, it was also possible to place the names of the sixteen houses of Eleazar in one urn, and those of the eight houses of Ithamar in the other. To accommodate the casting of the lots to the inequality of the numbers sixteen and eight, it was arranged that every house of Ithamar should reckon as two lots, or, what is the same thing, that every two houses of

Eleazar should be followed by one of Ithamar. If then we suppose a commencement to have been made with Eleazar, the order would be as follows: 1 and 2 Eleazar; 3, Ithamar; 4 and 5, Eleazar; 6, Ithamar; 7 and 8, Eleazar; 9, Ithamar; and so forth. The order in which the particular houses were to serve was then decided by lot in conformity with this arrangement. The relation between the numbers 8 and 16, and the words אחז and אחז אחז in this verse lead us to this, or some similar conclusion with reference to the manner, in which the order of service was determined by lot. In the different versions the statements contained in this passage have been either obliterated or altered; the former is the case in the *Septuagint* (εἷς εἷς τῷ Ἐλεάζαρ καὶ εἷς εἷς τῷ Ἰθάμαρ, the *Syriac* has the same rendering, but this does not suit the numbers 8 and 16) in the *Vulgate* the words are altered (*unam domum, quae ceteris praeerat, Eleazar; et alteram domum, quae sub se habebat ceteros, Itamar).* The exposition given by the Rabbins (*e.g. Kimchi*) is to my mind unintelligible; cf. *J. H. Michaelis* in loco. V. 19. *These are their classes of office for their service* (v. 3) *to come into the house of Jehovah according to the order, which was appointed for them through Aaron their father* (chap. vi. 17) *as Jehovah had commanded him.* The concluding words must refer to the expression, which frequently occurs in the Pentateuch: "Jehovah spake to Moses and Aaron," *e.g.* Num. iv. 1, 17.

(*d.*) Chap. xxiv. 20—31. *The leaders of the classes of the Levites.* On comparing the names in these verses with those in the section, chap. xxiii. 6—23, we find that the list before us is imperfect. For only the sons of Kohath and Merari are mentioned here; of the sons of Gershon, who must originally have had a place in this list by the side of the others, we find no trace in our present text. But even in that portion of the list which has been preserved, we miss a considerable number of names, which ought to be found in it according to the description given at the head. It is said to contain the names of the heads of the Levitical classes mentioned in chap. xxiii. 6—23 (see vv. 20—22, v. 24 seq.); but we find only the heads of five classes of the Kohathites named, the names of the leaders of the other four classes are omitted here (v. 23) as in chap. xxiii. 19. The same remark applies to the sons of Merari; the classes are noticed

again in this passage, but without the names of the leaders. V. 31. אבות הראשי; אבות is used here as in many other passages for *Beth Aboth: the father's-house, the head as well as his younger brother. The head* is in apposition to *the father's-house,* just as in chap. xxiii. 17—18 it is in apposition to the names of the fathers'-houses. The passage is paraphrased quite correctly by the Vulgate: *tam majores quam minores, omnes sors aequaliter dividebat.* The order of the classes of the Levites as determined by the lot is not given.

(*e.*) Chap. xxv. *The twenty-four classes of singers.* V. 1. *The princes of the army;* not the princes of the army of the Levites (Num. iv. 23), but *the leaders of the army of the Israelites,* for the princes, referred to here, must be the same as the "princes of Israel" mentioned in chap. xxiii. 2, and the "princes," chap. xxiv. 6, in connexion with whom the heads of the fathers'-houses of the priests and Levites are noticed in the latter passage, cf. chap. xxvi. 26, and xxvii. 5. *To separate to the service;* cf. 1 Kings viii. 53, and Num. xvi. 9. *The sons of Asaph;* the *lamed* is the sign of the accusative, Ezra viii. 24. V. 2. על ידי, cf. chap. vi. 16; this expression occurs four times in these verses. The singular על יד in the verse before us has precisely the same signification. The primary sense is *by the side of the king, of Asaph, &c.,* and this meaning is retained if we render the words, "*under the personal direction.*" But whether the passage really means that King David conducted the singing and the playing in the same manner as Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, is very doubtful. The expression may also be rendered "*according to the arrangements;*" and, if we adopt this meaning, we should learn from v. 6 that the musical arrangements were made by David, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, together, and hence in vv. 2, 3, and the first clause of v. 6, the reference would simply be to the organisation of the music and singing, though of course this would not preclude the personal superintendence of Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman. V. 5. *The seer,* or prophet *of the king,* we are not informed for what reason this title was given to Heman; in chap. xxi. 9 Gad is called the prophet of David, and in 2 Chr. xxix. 15, the same title is given to Jeduthun. *To blow the horns loudly according to the command of God;* cf. 2 Chr. xxix. 15, where בדברי האלהים must be rendered in this way; other expositors

suppose the meaning to be "in divine affairs," *i.e.* in the worship of God (cf. chap. xxvi. 32). הרים is immediately connected with קרן as in other passages with קול; lifting up the horn is equivalent to blowing it loud. V. 6. *All these are under the direction of their father* (Heman) *in the singing at the house of Jehovah, with cymbals, nablia, and viols, for the service of the house of God according to the arrangement of the king, &c.*; the twenty-four here mentioned were therefore set apart to accompany the singing with instrumental music; according to v. 7, every one of them was associated with eleven singers, *for their number together with their brethren, who were practised in singing for Jehovah*, the whole of those who were skilled were 288 = 12 × 24. The number here given merely refers to those who were skilled, for, according to chap. xxiii. 5, the entire body of those, who were set apart to praise Jehovah, numbered four thousand. —V. 8. גורלות משמרת (rendered by the Septuagint κλήρους ἐφημεριῶν) lots, by which the Mishmereth of every one of the twenty-four sections was fixed. לעמת stands here in a very peculiar position, it is in the construct state and yet the word governed by it is wanting (cf. chap. xxvi. 12). It is true that in some MSS. the word Mishmereth is repeated after it, so that the text reads משמרת לעמת משמרת (cf. xxvi. 16, Nehem. xii. 24), but this reading seems only to have originated in the desire to make the passage more intelligible. Jewish expositors affirm that the second Mishmereth may be supplied, and appeal to chap. xvii. 5, where the words אל משכן are supplied in a similar manner by ancient commentators. But it is worthy of remark that in Eccl. v. 15 the word לעמת occurs in quite as loose a connection before a whole clause, and as the words "*as the small so the great*," serve to define it more precisely, the construct state is not inadmissible. The meaning is: in the same manner, as the small so the great; and the words "*as the small so the great*," are used in chap. xxvi. 13 as being sufficient in themselves to express this meaning. *The skilful as well as the scholar*; the Aramaean word תלמיד only occurs in this passage of the Old Testament. From the previous verse it is evident, that the distinction implied in these words is that between the twelve skilled men in each of the classes, and the rest of the members of the same class.—Vv. 9—31. The result of the lot

was that the four sons of Asaph had the first, third, fifth, and seventh places; and the six sons of Jeduthun, the second, fourth, eighth, tenth, twelfth, and fourteenth; the four sons of Heman, the sixth, ninth, eleventh, and thirteenth. Just as the classes, into which the 24,000 Levites referred to in chap. xxiii. 6—23 were divided, are traced back to the three great families of Levi: Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, so are also the Levites, who had the charge of the music and singing; for their twenty-four classes are associated with the three men, Asaph, Jeduthun, and Heman, of whom Asaph was a descendant of Gershon, Jeduthun (also called Ethan) of Merari, and Heman of Kohath. In the account of the removal of the ark in chap. xv., the only one of the names mentioned here, which we find by the side of those of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan (or Jeduthun), is Matthiah (vv. 18, 21); but we have no reason to expect to find the names of the twenty-four classes mentioned here.

*(f.)* Chap. xxvi. 1—19. *The classes of the doorkeepers.* V. 8 The singular איש חיל (a man with strength) would necessarily refer to each one of the sons of Obed-edom: *every one was an able man with strength for the service;* but there is no possibility of concealing the difficulty connected with such an explanation, and in order to remove it we may perhaps assume that the word כל has fallen out before איש, cf. chap. x. 12.—V. 10. *Shimri the head,* not the firstborn (cf. Zechariah the firstborn, v. 2, Shemaiah the firstborn, v. 4), *for there was no firstborn,* probably because the family entitled to the right of primogeniture had died out (hence the Syriac: *his eldest son had died*), or because there were none of the existing families which could claim that right.—V. 12. *These classes of doorkeepers* (or to speak more precisely), *the head of the men* (chap. xxiv. 4, for these alone had been mentioned in the preceding verses) had the care of *the watches along with their brethren to render service in the house of Jehovah* (chap. xvi. 37).—V. 15. *And to his sons* (there was allotted the care of) *the house of collections.* The *house of Asuppim,* or briefly *Asuppim* (v. 17), was no doubt a store-house, which was situated in the outer fore-court; according to this passage it was near the south door of the temple, for the sons of Obed-edom had the charge of it, and they were doorkeepers towards the south. Two at a time were required to watch it (v.

17), from which we may perhaps infer that the house had two entrances, to each of which two doorkeepers were appointed. The rendering of the Vulgate *(in qua parte domus erat seniorum concilium)* seems merely to rest upon a conjecture that the word *Asuppim* means *an assembly of men.* In the Septuagint the word is retained κατέναντι οἴκου Ἐσεφίμ.—V. 16. *To Shuppim* is perfectly unintelligible. The word can only be taken as a proper name (chap. vii. 12), but the context does not lead us to expect a proper name here, on the contrary, according to the order preserved in these verses generally, "*to Hosah*" should follow directly. The name Shuppim does not occur in the Septuagint. Hence we may assume that it crept into the text through an error in consequence of the repetition of the last two syllables of the word before. *To Hosah* fell the lot *towards the west. The gate Shalleketh* (perhaps the *rubbish gate*, 2 Kings xxiii. 11) is only mentioned here. The intimation that it was *on the rising road* helps us to determine its position. According to the context we must look for it on the western side of the outer fore-court, opposite to the western door of the temple. This gate was reached by an ascending road leading from the lower city, for the area of the temple, on the western edge of which the gate was situated, overhung the lower city. *One watch over against the other;* because it was Hosah's duty to provide with a watch both the western gate of the temple and also the gate Shalleketh, which was opposite to it; see v. 18.—V. 17 seq. Recapitulation of the posts, which the porters had to occupy, and an account of the number employed. Six men were stationed at the east gate, four men were engaged every day at the north gate, four at the south gate, and at the stores or storehouse (v. 15) near the south door two each, probably posted at two different places; lastly, at the Pharbar towards the west there were six men stationed, four of whom kept guard on the outside *towards the* (ascending) *road* mentioned in v. 16, and two in the inside *towards Pharbar.* Hence there were twenty-four men employed daily in keeping guard. Are we to understand by this twenty-four men, or twenty-four leaders with their attendants? In the previous verses there can be no doubt that the leaders of the porters alone are mentioned (cf. v. 12); according to chap. xxiii. 6, the whole number of the porters was 4000, a

number from which we may conclude that far more than twenty-four individuals would be employed every day in keeping guard. It might be thought that the thousands referred to in chap. xxiii. 6 are not adopted to furnish us with a criterion by which to reply to the query just raised, since the numbers given in the more precise details are always considerably smaller. But the number mentioned here, twenty-four, seems to indicate that the individuals referred to were the leaders of twenty-four divisions. —V. 19. The conclusion again points out the fact that the porters were taken from the Korahites (Kohathites) and Merarites (cf. vv. 1 and 10).

(*g*.) Chap. xxvi. 20—28. *The managers of the treasures of the sanctuary.*—V. 20. The heading "*and the Levites*" could only indicate that the section which follows treated of Levites, who were neither singers nor porters. But we are struck by its brevity. Ahijah, whose name occurs immediately after the word *Levites*, is not mentioned in the previous lists, whereas they contain the names of most of the other officers referred to, and notices of all the families to which they belonged; moreover in the case of the rest of the officers both their families and pedigree are given with intentional fulness, whereas Ahijah, whose name is totally unknown, is introduced abruptly without further information; and lastly, if this Ahijah was *over the treasures of the house of God and the treasures of the consecrated things*, he must have united in his own person those very offices, of which the occupants are named in the verses that follow. We cannot therefore come to any other conclusion than that the reading is incorrect. Now the *Septuagint* contains no notice of Ahijah, but has instead the very suitable heading: *καὶ οἱ Λευῖται ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν οἴκου κυρίου καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θησαυρῶν τῶν καθηγιασμένων.* Hence in the place of והלוים אחיה they read והלוים אחיהם (*cf. e.g.*, chap. vi. 29; 2 Chr. xxix. 34); and this reading has been already defended by *J. D. Michaelis* in the notes to his German translation of the Old Testament.—V. 21. *The sons of Laadan* (or to point out their Levitical descent with greater precision) *the sons of the Gershunnite* (or of Gershon), who belong to *Laadan* (chap. xxiii. 7 seq.), *the heads of the fathers' houses of Laadan the Gershunnite: Jechieli* (v. 22) *and the sons of Jechieli Zetham and Joel his brother are*

(over the) *treasures of the house of Jehovah.*—V. 23. For the four large families of the Levitical gens, Kohath: Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (the last is always called Uzziel, chap. xxiii. 12, and *v.* 28, but the adjective in *i*, *Ozzieli*, is found in Num. iii. 27 as well as here).—V 24. *Shebuel the son of Gershom the son of Moses was prince over the treasures.* There can hardly be any doubt that this is the meaning intended to be conveyed by the passage, but to bring it clearly out the *Vav cop.* before Shebuel, which does not appear in the *Vulgate*, must be erased. Shebuel has been mentioned already in chap. xxiii. 16 and xxiv. 20 (Shubael).—V. 25. *And his* (viz., Shebuel's) *brethren* (who belong) *to Eliezer* (are) *Rechabiah his* (Eliezer's) *son* or the sons of Rechabiah (chap. xxiv. 21); but these were brethren of Shebuel, because they were descended from Moses through Eliezer, of whom the sons of Shebuel were descendants through his son Gershom (chap. xxiii. 16 seq.). From the sons of Rechabiah sprang *Shelomith* or *Shelomoth*, a celebrated man, as the careful account of his ancestors clearly shows.—V. 26. *And this Shelomoth and his brethren were over all the treasures of the consecrated gifts, which David the king and the heads of the fathers'-houses and the princes* (instead of לְשָׂרֵי the reading וְשָׂרֵי as in chap. xxix. 6 must be adopted, as it has been by the *Vulgate*) *over the thousands and over the hundreds and the princes of the army had dedicated.*—V. 27. A parenthesis: *of the wars and of the spoil* (in other words, *of the spoil taken in the wars*) *they had dedicated to make the house of Jehovah strong.* חִזֵּק in other passages means to strengthen old buildings and walls by repairing them (2 Kings xii. 7 sqq.; Neh. iii. 7 sqq.), but this cannot be the meaning here. The word occurs in chap. xxix. 12 along with גַּדֵּל, and as making great and making strong are correlative notions, we feel no hesitation in rendering it here *to make great and strong.* The *lamed* in *l'beth* is a sign of the accusative, cf. chap. xxix. 12.—V. 28. The הַ in הִהקְדִּישׁ takes the place of the relative pronoun, as in chap. xxix. 17; 2 Chr. xxix. 36; Ezra viii. 25, x. 14, 17. כֹּל הַמַּקְדִּישׁ concludes the account: that which had been dedicated by *all who had dedicated* was *on the hand of Shelomoth and his brethren*, *i.e.*, it was entrusted to them.—There was thus a threefold distinction made in the treasures, that were committed to

the custody of the different officers: 1. The sons of Jechieli (Zetham and Joel) had the oversight of the treasures of the house of God, which, as we may infer from chap. xxix. 8, had been brought in the shape of freewill-offerings; (2) Shebuel was prince over the treasures, perhaps over the money which had accumulated from the regular tax for the sanctuary (Ex. xxx. 11—16), the redemption-fees (*e.g.* for the first-born, Num. xviii. 16 sqq.), or the discharge of vows (Lev. xxvii.); hence he had the charge of a portion of the money which is described in 2 Kings xii. 5 as כסף הקדשים; (3) Shelomith and his brethren had the care of the dedicated offerings, which are called the holy things in 2 Kings in xii. 19, in distinction from the *sacred money* mentioned in v. 5. Zetham and Joel belonged to the family of Gershon; Shebuel and Shelomith to that of Kohath; and the third great Levitical family, Merari, had no share in the management of the treasures.

(*h.*) Chap. xxvi. 29—32. *The officers appointed for outward affairs.*—V. 29. *Chenaniah* (chap. xv. 22, 27) *and his sons* (who belonged to the family of) *Izhar* (and to the *gens* of Kohath) *for outward business, as scribes and judges.* The outward business of the Levites, in contradistinction to the work connected with the service of the sanctuary, seems from this to have consisted in the discharge of the functions of scribes and judges (chap. xxiii. 4.) From Neh. xi. 16, it appears that the outward business was also connected with the temple, embracing perhaps the collection of contributions; and since the officers mentioned in v. 30—32 had to look after this, it may be assumed that they also, like the scribes and judges, were reckoned among the officers who had the charge of the outward business, although it is not expressly stated in these verses.—V. 30. *Hashabiah and his brethren,* (who belonged to the family of Hebron of the *gens* of Kohath), *brave men, seventeen hundred* were *over the contributions* (פְּקֻדָּה must here mean that which was determined, a fixed tax or contribution, and this meaning is required on account of its connection with "Israel," which is not met with anywhere else; see, *e.g.*, chap. xxiii. 11 and xxiv. 3) *of Israel on the side of the Jordan towards the west* (a similar description of the country on this side of the river is found in Josh. xxii. 7) *for all the affairs of Jehovah and for the service of the king* (cf. v. 32).—V. 31. *Jerijah the*

*head and*—(v. 32) *his brethren* (who also belonged to the family of Hebron) *were valiant men, two thousand seven hundred heads of fathers'-houses, whom David had appointed as overseers over the two tribes and a half on the east of the Jordan, for every affair of God and for every affair of the king.* Between "*Jerijah the head*" in *v.* 31, and "*and his brethren*" in *v.* 32, we have the parenthesis: *as for the Hebronites, according to their descents, according to fathers'-houses, they were examined in the fortieth year of David's reign, and there were found among them brave heroes in Jazer in Gilead* (cf. *v. Raumer* Pal. p. 229). This parenthesis, which treats of distinguished Hebronites in the country to the east of the Jordan, and explains the reason why they were entrusted with the post of overseers, separates the connected parts of the same sentence, and thus renders the meaning of these two verses somewhat obscure.

## 9. CHAPTER XXVII.

### ACCOUNT OF THE ARMY AND OF DAVID'S OFFICERS.

Vv. 1—15. *The twelve divisions of the army.* V. 1. Full heading to the lists which follow in vv. 2—15: *and the sons of Israel according to their number* (in definite numbers), *the heads of the fathers'-houses and the princes over the thousands and the* hundreds and their scribes who served the king in every affair of *the divisions, which came in and went out month by month of all months of the year, one division twenty-four thousand men.* In the list itself, however, we find only the twelve classes, the list of those belonging to them, and their leaders; so that the short heading: the Israelites according to their number and the princes of the divisions who served the king (cf. chap. xxviii. 1) would fully suffice. It may be safely assumed that the heading originally referred to a more elaborate description of the classes and their different officers, from which we have here only a shorter extract.—V. 3. Apposition to Jashobeam (v. 2): *of the sons of Perez, the head of all the princes of the armies for the first month.* Hence it is not said that Jashobeam was the head of all the princes of the armies, but it is emphatically stated that he, the man of the family of Perez, from whom David also sprang,

had the command in chief of all the princes of division for the first month. The commander of the whole army was Joab, v. 34.—V. 4. Before *Dodai* there must have fallen out "*Eliezer the son of*," according to chap. xi. 12. ומחלקתו ומקלות הנגיד, thoroughly unintelligible words: at the end of verse 6 a similar passage occurs, from which we may see that the Vav before the middle word should be erased: "*and his division, Mikloth the prince*" might perhaps mean and his division is that over which Mikloth was prince. The expression is very brief, merely containing a hint, but in a short list we cannot be surprised to find merely hints in the place of full sentences. V. 7. *Asahel* (chap. xi. 26); he was slain by Abner at the very commencement of David's reign, (2 Sam. ii. 18—23); perhaps the company, of which Asahel was the captain, may have been increased to a division when the plan of the twelve divisions was afterwards adopted, and may have continued to pass as Asahel's division; or it is possible that one division may have been called by the name of the fallen hero in honour of his memory. In the words "*and Gebadiah his son after him*," after his death, there is certainly contained an intimation of Asahel's death at the beginning of David's reign.

Vv. 16—24. *The princes of the twelve tribes.* The tribes mentioned are Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulon, Naphtali, Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, and Dan; Gad and Asher are omitted. In the list of the tribes in chap. iv., vii., Zebulon is wanting, and as we know of no reason for the omission of the name of Zebulon there, so are we unable to determine why Gad and Asher should not be mentioned here.—V. 18. *Elihu*, probably the same as Eliab mentioned in chap. ii. 13; the Septuagint rendering is Ἐλιὰβ τῶν ἀδελφῶν Δαυίδ. He was the eldest brother of David, the first-born of his father, and as such had probably a right to be a ruler in the tribe of Judah.—V. 23. The fact, that *David had not taken their number from those who were twenty years old and under*, is accounted for in the clause which follows: *for Jehovah had promised to make Israel as numerous as the stars of heaven* (Gen. xxii. 17). The meaning of this explanation can only be that the foregoing numbers do not refer to all the Israelites, because it was impossible for David to number them all, since they were as numerous as the stars of heaven which cannot be numbered. The numbering of the

Israelites from twenty years and upwards was undertaken, as we may infer from the reference made to it in this passage, in order that its results might be made available for dividing the army into twelve sections, and for the other arrangements described in this chapter.—V. 24. The numbering was undertaken by *Joab ben Zeruiah, who began to number, but did not complete it, and it was the cause of wrath* (from God) *upon Israel* (2 Chr. xix. 10, xxiv. 18). The numbering referred to is that of which we have a full account in chap. xxi.; it was never finished (v. 6), and the consequence of the wrath of God was a pestilence (v. 14). The word במספר is generally supposed to denote a *book*. But this would be the only passage in which it had such a meaning, and the use of it before דברי הימים (the daily histories) is the more striking, as we find in every other case the word *sepher* in this connexion (*e.g.* 2 Kings xii. 20, xiii. 8—12, xiv. 15, 18, 28, xv. 6). It might be imagined, that through the influence of the previous word *mispar* our *b'mispar* had been substituted for b'sepher, but as the expression ספר דברי הימים does not occur in the Chronicles, we must retain the word as written in the text, and render the passage thus: *and the number did not come into the number of the daily records of King David.* In this case "into the number" would mean into the section which treats of the numbering. It is not expressly stated for what reason the account of the numbering had no place in the daily records of David, but it is evident from the context of this verse, that there were scruples felt as to the preservation of an exact record, because of the mournful events connected with the census, and the wrath of God of which it had been the occasion. The account of the census taken by Joab was given above (chap. xxi. 5), but, as this passage clearly shows, it must have been copied from some other source, and not from the daily records of David. At the same time this remark seems to indicate that the lists given in the present chapter, and possibly those in the preceding chapters, were taken from the daily records of David, for the intimation that the account of the numbering was not to be found in them certainly implies, that other accounts given here could be found there.

Vv. 25—31. *The officers who had the charge of David's property and possessions.* The list is very exact, and claims our

attention not merely on account of the names, but for the description which it contains of the possessions and revenue of the king. His property consisted of: (1) *treasures*, or rather, as the contrast to No. 2 shows, such of the treasures as were kept in Jerusalem ;—(2) *treasures in the field, in the cities, in the villages, and in the towers and fortresses*, by which we are most likely to understand the income which the king derived from his property outside Jerusalem ;—(3) *corn-fields* ;—(4) *vineyards* ;—(5) *plantations of olives and sycamores in the Shephelah*, *i.e.* the fertile plain, between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean Sea ; the king's officers had to see to the cultivation of the fields, vineyards, and plantations; and again certain of the officers had the oversight of *the stores of wine in the vineyards* (v. 27) *and the stores of oil* (v. 28) ;—(6) *oxen*, both those which were fed in Sharon, the strip of land along the coast between Cæsarea Palestinae, and Joppa, and those which were scattered in the different valleys of the land; (7) *camels* ;—(8) *asses* ;—(9) *sheep*. All these possessions are included in v. 31 under the one word רכוש, which is used in other passages to denote the moveable possessions of nomad chiefs (*e.g.* Gen. xii. 5; xiii. 6); and the men who had the management of these are called both here and in the next chapter "princes of the *recosh*" (substance), "princes of all the *recosh*." As the expression *recosh* calls to mind the circumstances of the Israelites in former times, when their leaders were nomad-chiefs, so do many of the possessions point back to the same circumstances, whilst others (*e.g.* the towers) contain a clear indication of the great change, which had taken place in Israel through the introduction of a monarchical government. The property of David consisted partly of those things, which constitute the wealth of a nomad-chief, and partly of the things which furnish the king of an organized state, whose foundations rest on the firm basis of agriculture and well regulated commerce, with the means of giving stability to his throne. It cannot be an accidental thing that just twelve officers should be named. The management of the royal possessions was also divided into twelve sections; so that the number, which occurs so frequently as a normal number in the political and religious institutions of the people, was also followed in connexion with the property referred to here. Of the officers *Shimei* was of

*Ramah* in the land of Benjamin; Zabdi of *Shepam* (probably on the south-eastern frontier of the land of Judah, Num. xxxiv. 10 seq.); Baal-Hanan of *Geder* or *Gedera* in the land of Judah; Shihai or Shirtai (Keri) of *Sharon*, the strip of land on the coast; Obil (whose name reminds us of the Arabic word for *a camel-driver)* of the people of *Ishmael;* Jechdeiah of *Meronoth*, a place unknown to us (the Septuagint has *ὁ ἐκ Μεραθών*, but we never meet with a place of this name); Jazir of the people of *Hagar* (*cf.* chap. v. 10—19). Thus there were foreigners among these officers; an Ishmaelite and a Hagarite had charge of the camels and the sheep, which were probably kept in districts, that had formerly supplied the nomadic Ishmaelites and Hagarites with pasture for their camels and sheep, but had come into David's possession in consequence of his conquests in the country to the east of the Jordan. The vineyards, in which the stores of wine were kept (v. 27), were no doubt in the vine-growing districts to the south of the land, especially in the province of Judah (Num. xiii. 23 seq.; Gen. xlix. 11 seq.), and the charge of them was entrusted to two men, belonging to these districts.

Vv. 32—34. *A short list of David's ministers*, which forms a counterpart both in its contents and style to the lists contained in 2 Sam. viii. 15—18; 1 Chr. xviii. 15—17; and 2 Sam. xx. 23—26. If with few exceptions we find different names here from those in the other lists, we must bear in mind that some of the persons mentioned were appointed to other departments of service (we find no *counsellor* in the other lists, and no one who was "*with the king's sons*"), whilst in other cases we have here successors in the same office.—V. 32. There is a *Jonathan*, son of Shimea, David's brother, mentioned in chap. xx. 7 and 2 Sam. xxi. 21, probably the same person as *the relative of David* referred to here; דוד, usually the father's brother (hence *Septuagint* *παράδελφος*, *Vulgate* patruus), is also used for a *relation* generally, and therefore may include a nephew. This Jonathan was a *counsellor* (and as is added), *an intelligent and learned man was he.* סופר does not denote the office, but when used with מֵבִין means *learned, versed in the Scriptures*, as in Ezra vii. 6. The office of Sopher was filled by Shavshah (chap. xviii. 16). *Jehiel ben Chakmoni was with the king's sons*, probably as tutor; whether the Jehiel mentioned in chap. xxiii. 8 is meant we can-

not tell; in chap. xi. 11 Jashobeam is called a son of Chakmoni. —V. 33. *Ahithophel* (2 Sam. xv. 31, xvi. 23, xvii. 1 sqq.) is also described in the passages quoted as the confidential counsellor of the king, who killed himself at the time of Absalom's conspiracy. —V. 34. After *Ahithophel*, probably after his death, *Jehoiada ben Benaiah was the king's counsellor.* We need not hesitate to pronounce this a case of transposition, since the person referred to must certainly be the Benaiah ben Jehoiada, who is already known to us in connection with David's history (v. 5, chap. xi. 22), and who is described in the other lists (*e.g.*, chap. xviii. 17) as the captain of David's body-guard, a post which by no means precluded him from attending the king as counsellor. If, however, this conjecture is not adopted, we must suppose him to have been a son of this Benaiah, and to have been called by his grandfather's name. *And Abiathar;* are we to supply: *was also counsellor?* The high priest of the family of Ithamar is referred to here. *Joab* occurs in all the lists. Hence, if we except Jehiel, the names given here are already known to us in connection with the history of David in the Books of Samuel. But the list itself cannot have been taken from those books, for the precise account of the offices which they filled is not given there. We must therefore conclude that this list was taken from the same sources to which our historian had already gone for the lists given before.

## 10. CHAP. XXVIII.—XXIX.

### DAVID'S LAST INSTRUCTIONS; AND HIS DEATH.

Chap. xxviii. *In an assembly of the people David seriously charges Solomon to build the temple.*—V. 1. *All the princes of Israel*, viz., *the princes of the tribes* (a list of whom is given in chap. xxvii. 16—22), *the princes of the divisions that serve the king* (chap. xxvii. 1—15), *the princes of the thousands and of the hundreds* (chap. xxvii. 1), *the princes of all the property and possessions of the king and his sons* (they are described in chap. xxvii. 25—31, though nothing is said there about the property of David's sons; the *Vulgate* has *filiosque suos*, but the *lamed*

can hardly be the sign of the accusative in this instance, for it is prefixed to לַמֶּלֶךְ, the word immediately before, and if the sons of David were to be expressly singled out as taking part in the assembly, it is not likely that they would be noticed in so incidental a manner), *along with the officers of the court, and the heroes, and all the brave heroes* (the *lamed* here is the sign of the accusative, for as the governing verb is at so great a distance it was natural to point out the case by means of the preposition) *to Jerusalem.*—סריסים *eunuchs, Sept.* σὺν τοῖς εὐνούχοις, *Vulg. cum eunuchis.* They are mentioned in 1 Sam. viii. 15 as officers of the kings of Israel, and also in 1 Kings xxii. 9 and other passages. The primary meaning of the word need not be always stringently maintained; for as the officers of court were usually eunuchs, the word may easily have come to denote such officers, even when they were not actually eunuchs. Moreover, we may assume without any hesitation that the practice of the courts of heathen kings, *e.g.*, the Babylonian and Persian, in which the Sarisim are frequently mentioned, had some influence in determining the use of the word here (cf. 2 Kings xx. 18; Esther i. 10—15).—V. 2. The aged king *stood up upon his feet*, that he might address the assembled people standing. Hitherto he had probably been sitting upon his throne, not lying upon his bed as Jewish expositors infer from 1 Kings i. 1.—*My brethren;* 1 Sam. xxx. 23; 2 Sam. xix. 13. *I, in my heart to build;* I had it in my mind to build, cf. chap. xxii. 7. *For the ark of the covenant of Jehovah and for the footstool of the feet of our God; i.e.*, for the ark and for the כַּפֹּרֶת over it, which might be described as his footstool, because the glory of Jehovah was enthroned above it betwen the cherubim. This is in harmony with v. 11 where the holy of holies is called בית הכפרת. *I have made ready for building;* by collecting materials (chap. xxii. 2—4, 14 sqq.)—V. 4. On the first words see chap. xi. 2. *And Judah he hath chosen as prince*, cf. chap. v. 2.—V. 5. After the parenthesis, *for Jehovah hath given me many sons*, the address is not continued with the perfect, and of all my sons *he chose Solomon*, but has a fresh beginning: *then he chose. Upon the throne of the kingdom of Jehovah;* this expression only occurs here. There is a similar one in chap. xxix. 23, *the throne of Jehovah*,

compare chap. xvii. 14, "My kingdom."—V. 6, see chap. xxii. 10. —V. 7. *Establishes his kingdom;* chap. xvii. 11. *If he be constant;* a similar condition is imposed upon Solomon by God in 1 Kings iii. 14, ix. 4; and the words of Solomon in 1 Kings viii. 61 also call to mind these words, in which the expression *as at this time* also occurs, cf. 2 Chr. vi. 15.—V. 8. *And now before the eyes of all Israel, the assembled community of Jehovah, and in the ears of our God,* I impress the injunction upon your hearts: *observe and seek,* &c. The solemn injunction recals Deut. iv. 26, xxx. 19, and the conclusion of the verse reminds of Deut. iv. 21; Jer. iii. 18; Lev. xxv. 46.—V. 9. David now turns to Solomon; the commencement of his address to him is contained in vv. 9, 10, and, after a long parenthesis vv. 11—19, the continuation in vv. 20, 21.—Give heed to *the God of thy father;* according to chap. xxix. 10 we might be led to suppose that reference was here made to Israel, the common father of all the Israelites, but a comparison of chap. xxviii. 20 shows that it is more natural to suppose that the God of David is meant here, the God who had always assisted David (Ps. xviii. 3). בלב שלם *with a perfect and entire heart,* chap. xxix. 9—19; 1 Kings viii. 61.—V. 10. The expression, "*be strong and do it,*" is repeated in v. 20, so that the address which is broken off here is taken up again by the repetition of the concluding words of the verse before us.

Vv. 11—19. David breaks off his address, and gives to Solomon the sketches and plans of the sacred buildings and other objects, vv. 11—18, accompanying the gifts with the solemn words contained in v. 19. The proceedings in the assembly are described with dramatic distinctness, and only in proportion as we enter thoroughly into the lifelike narrative before us, can we explain the introduction of the account contained in these verses precisely in this connexion.—V. 11. *The pattern;* Ex. xxv. 40. *The hall;* 1 Kings vi. 3; 2 Chr. iii. 4. ובתיו not, *and of the houses of the hall;* the masculine suffix refers to the *temple,* as we may clearly see from the words that follow, in which the suffix is repeated. The word *temple* may easily be supplied. The buildings referred to are those for the two divisions of the temple, for the nave or holy place, and for the room behind or holy of holies. גנזכין only occurs in this passage; the connexion with גנזים Esther iii. 9, iv. 7, and the Chaldee גנזין Ezra vii. 20, is unmis-

takeable, and the meaning *treasure-chambers* is thereby sustained. These rooms were probably in the house of three stories high by the side of the temple. עליותיו, which is also met with in 2 Chr. iii. 9, is only used in these two passages. The reference is to the *upper chambers* of the temple. We are not told where they were built. Probably they were between the ceiling of the Debir, or holy of holies, and the roof of the building, which no doubt kept the same level over all the three principal divisions of the temple. The roof was thirty cubits high, the Debir was twenty cubits square, and twenty high; there was therefore a space between of twenty cubits square and ten in height which may have been divided into several rooms, or *upper chambers*. The *inner chambers* must mean the forecourt and the nave or holy place, since the *Beth haccapporeth* or holy of holies, where the ark of the covenant, with the Capporeth, was kept (Ex. xxv. 17 sqq ), follows immediately after.—V. 12. *And the form of all that was in the spirit with him;* the spirit with him is τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν αὐτῷ, 1 Cor. ii. 11; the form of that which floated before his mind he communicated to Solomon. The word כל which is directly governed by *tabnith* is continued by the words: *the form of the forecourts of the house of Jehovah, and of all the cells round about* (chap. xxiii. 28) *for the treasures, &c.* which are governed by *lamed.*—*The dedicated things:* see chap. xxvi. 26.—V. 13. לכל continuation of לאוצרות in the previous verse: *for the treasures—and for the divisions of the priests—and for the whole work—and for all the vessels, &c.* We might regard these words as a continuation of לחצרות and לכל־הלשכות in the foregoing verse, and explain them thus: "David gave him the pattern of the divisions, of the entire work," &c., the meaning of which would be, he gave him instructions with reference to the divisions, &c.; but this would be an arbitrary explanation. —V. 14. Continuation of v. 14 *(all instruments):* he gave him the pattern *of the golden* (the golden articles chap. xxix. 2) *according to the weight for the golden, for all* (golden) *articles of every kind of service, and* (he gave him the pattern) *of all the silver articles according to the weight for all articles of every kind of service.*—V. 15. *The weight;* accusative of the objects governed by "he gave" in v. 11. *And for their golden lamps, according to the weight of every single candlestick, and of its lamps,* (and similarly the fol-

lowing words:) he gave him the weight *of the silver candlesticks according to weight for each particular candlestick and its lamps according to the service* (as the service required) *of each particular candlestick.*—V. 16. *He gave him the gold by weight for the tables of shewbread.* In other passages we read of only *one table of shewbread* (Ex. xxv. 23 sqq.; 1 Kings vii. 48; and even 2 Chr. xxix. 18), but here there are said to have been several. According to 2 Chr. iv. 8 Solomon had ten tables made, probably for the ten golden candlesticks (1 Kings vii. 49), but these could not be described as שלחנות המערכת. If, however, according to the author's own account in 2 Chr. xxix. 18 there was only *one* table of shewbread in Solomon's temple, the words before us must be regarded as containing a general expression, intended to include the table of shewbread and the rest of the tables (see Josephus Antiq. viii. 3, 7). *And silver for the silver tables;* these are only mentioned here, and we have no information in the Old Testament as to the purpose to which they were applied. The Rabbins are of opinion that they stood in the forecourt, and that the flesh of the sacrificial animals was laid upon them.—V. 17. Before the first three words it is most natural to supply from v. 11 the words: he gave him the form *of the forks, &c.* On the first two words cf. Ex. xxvii. 3. ולכפורי, he gave him the pattern *of the golden pitchers according to weight* (v. 15) *for each particular pitcher;* the pitchers here referred to were probably pitchers with lids, they are also noticed in Ezra i. 10, and viii. 27. V. 18. *And he gave the pattern of the altar of incense of refined gold according to the weight.* At the close of the account the accusative תבנית is repeated from v. 11, and, on account of the distance at which it stands from its verb, is marked as an accusative by the preposition *lamed: he gave the pattern of the chariot of the cherubim of gold.* The word cherubim is in apposition to chariots; the cherubim are the chariots on which God rides or is enthroned (Ps. xviii. 11, xcix. 1; Ex. xxv. 22); it is true that Ezekiel speaks of wheels on which the throne of God rests (Ezek. i. 26), and which are seen beside the cherubim (v. 15 sqq., cf. Ecclus. xlix. 8), and in accordance with this the Septuagint renders the passage before us *καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ ἅρματος τῶν χερουβίμ.* The Vulgate calls to mind still more decidedly the four cherubim of Ezekiel by the words *quadriga cherubim*, but in the figures above the ark of the covenant there was no representation of a

chariot drawn by the cherubim, nor is there anything to suggest this idea in the passage under consideration. פרשים without the article, and with the preposition *lamed*, is quite unintelligible, the two participles פרשים and סככים, as we may clearly see from 2 Chr. v. 8, Ex. xxv..20, 1 Kings viii. 7, must stand in apposition to *hacceruhim*, and hence the passage should read הַפּרשים וְהַסככים, *which spread out* their wings and *cover over the ark of the covenant of Jehovah*; in both the Septuagint and Vulgate this rendering is adopted. The words do not admit of any other explanation; yet even assuming that the *lamed* is prefixed in the loosest possible manner, the reading of the text cannot be made to yield this sense. The supposition, that לפרשים might mean *ut essent expandentes* sc. *alas suas* (*J. H. Michaelis*), merely hides the difficulty, but does not remove it. V. 19 בכתב מיד יהוה עלי, these words are closely connected together (cf. *al* in chap. xi. 10; Judg. xix. 20; Neh. ii. 8, 18): *by a writing from the hand of Jehovah upon me*, *i.e.* by a writing which was given to me as a rule. The nominative to the verb "taught," can only be Jehovah, which can easily be supplied from the expression "hand of Jehovah." The suffix in עלי refers to David, whose words are introduced here as in chap. xxiii. 4 seq. without any further notice. Thus David says: *all this has Jehovah taught me through a writing from Jehovah's hand given to me as a rule, all the works of the pattern, &c.*, *i.e.* all these works that have not yet been carried out; and the תבנית or design of which has been already described in the previous verses. A writing from the hand of Jehovah is a writing containing a divine revelation; as in 2 Chr. xxix. 15 the command by the hand of Jehovah is equivalent to the command by the hand of the prophets, so the writing by the hand of Jehovah may here mean a writing drawn up by divine direction. But as the description of the sacred objects in Ex. xxv. sqq. evidently forms the groundwork of that contained in these verses, we are led to the conclusion that by "the writing from the hand of Jehovah," we are to understand the law of Moses. To this law David appeals, as a proof that he had not invented the models of the sacred buildings and objects which floated before his spirit (v. 12) in an arbitrary manner, just as Josiah in making his arrangements appealed to a writing of David and his son Solomon (2 Chr. xxxv. 4). Hence we find in this a reference to a sacred writing, or, to use the expression employed by

the Jews in very early times to the תורה שבכתב, the law in the Scripture. (*Keil* [p. 318] regards this as an announcement of a special revelation, "Just as the Lord had formerly shown to Moses the pattern of the tabernacle [Ex. xxv. 40, xxvi. 30] so did he also make known by revelation to David the pattern of the temple and its furniture.") The whole section from vv. 11—19 gives prominence to the fact that David not only made preparation for the building of the temple by collecting materials, &c., but that he gave to Solomon definite directions for completing the erection and constructing the sacred vessels, and that in doing this he did not follow his own ideas or adopt arbitrary plans, but was guided by divine revelation. The temple of Solomon was concluded after the model of the Mosaic sanctuary; for the ancient sanctuary of Moses God himself had given the measures and the plans (Ex. xxv. sqq.); David followed these divine plans and measures, when he gave directions to Solomon for the building of the temple. In the Books of Kings no mention is made of this. David was not permitted to build the temple, but he had carried out the preparations to such an extent that in the fourth year of his reign Solomon was able to commence the building, and in the eleventh it was complete (1 Kings vi.).

Vv. 20, 21. The address to Solomon, which was broken off at v. 10, is here resumed. V. 20. On the exhortation in the former part of the verse, cf. chap. xxii. 13.—V. 21. "And behold," this exclamation refers to the divisions of the priests and Levites, who are to be regarded as having taken part in the large assembly, although not specially named. נדיב בחכמה only occurs here; נדיב generally denotes one who brings freewill offerings, here one who is ready with wisdom for every service; the skilful workmen and artists, mentioned in chap. xxii. 15, 2 Chr. ii. 6, who were ready to assist in the building of the temple, are here referred to. The combination of the words נדיב and חכמה was probably suggested by Ex. xxxv. 5, 22, and xxxvi. 1. The *lamed* before כל נדיב is very remarkable, standing as it does in the middle of the sentence: *and with me in every work are all volunteers with wisdom;* hence we cannot set it down as a *lamed* of introduction, meaning, "so far as all the volunteers are concerned," for, however freely it might be used in a con-

tinued narrative (chap. xxix. 6), it could hardly stand in the middle of a sentence. Instead of *lamed* the Septuagint has the *vav copul.* which is also unsuitable; we cannot discover upon what text the Vulgate is based. We must decide to read כל instead of לכל; the latter could easily be written for the former through a mere error of the pen, as *l'col* occurs just before and twice immediately afterwards.

Chap. xxix. 1—5. *David asks for voluntary contributions towards the building of the temple,* just as Moses had formerly asked the Israelites for freewill offerings for the tabernacle and its furniture (Ex. xxv. 1—8).—V. 1. The parenthetical clause "*when God hath chosen him alone,*" is to be regarded as a relative and explained in this manner: Solomon, whom alone God hath chosen, is young and tender, but though he is young and tender, still he must undertake the great work, for God has chosen him and no other. On the expression, "young and tender," see chap. xxii. 5. בירה, a great building, generally used to denote the palace or the residence of the Persian kings (Esther i. 2, 5, ii. 3, 8; Neh. i. 1); this is the only passage in which it is applied to the magnificent temple (in Neh. ii. 8, the castle by the side of the temple is meant). The word is only met with in the Chronicles and in Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel; and in the singular is always written with the article.—V. 2. cf. chap. xxii. 14. *The gold for the golden; i.e.,* for the vessels and ornaments of gold, v. 5, chap. xxviii. 14.—אבני שהם ומלואים (אבני פוך according to Ex. xxv. 7, xxviii. 9, xxxv. 9); probably stones of a black and brilliant colour, like the Stibium and the black colour prepared from it; in Is. liv. 4, 11, *puk* is mentioned as a costly cement. The אבני רקמה were probably stones with veins of different colours. אבן יקרה, according to 2 Chr. iii. 6, was for decorating the walls. שיש, which we only meet with in Esther i. 6, Song of Solomon v. 15, and here, is rendered *Parian marble* in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate.*—V. 3. *And moreover with my love to the house of Jehovah, I have a treasure of silver and gold, I shall have given it* (the perfect to denote a fixed resolution) *to the house of God over and above all that I have prepared for the holy house;* כל in the construct state before the verb הכינותי, which is added without the relative pronoun; cf. chap. xv. 12.—V. 4. Three thousand

talents of gold are about ninety million thalers (£13,500,000); seven thousand talents of silver, about eighteen million thalers (£2,700,000); an amount nearly equal to the bullion in the Bank of England (cf. chap. xxii. 14). *The houses;* cf. chap. xxviii. 11.—V. 5. *of gold,* cf. v. 2.

Vv. 6—9. *The princes cheerfully follow the example set by David and obey his exhortation.*—V. 6. *Princes of the fathers,* in other places *heads of the fathers* (chap. xxiv. 31, xxvii. 1).—ולשרי מלאכת, the *lamed* is not rendered in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate,* still we are not warranted in erasing it from the text, as the introductory *lamed* (*and as regards the princes of the king*) is probably selected here for the purpose of laying greater emphasis upon those who are mentioned last in the series. The princes referred to here are those whose names are given in chap. xxvii. 25—31.—V. 7. *Ten thousand darics;* the word אדרכנים only occurs here and at Ezra viii. 27; in Ezra ii. 69 and Neh. vii. 70 sqq. we have דַּרְכְּמֹנִים. Are we to understand it as denoting a δραχμή or a δαρεικός? *Darcemonim* certainly reminds us of a δραχμή, the other word, which can hardly be a mere abbreviation of Darkemon, does not bear the least resemblance to δραχμή. In the versions it is not rendered by δραχμή, but by a word denoting a current coin, in the *Septuagint* by χρυσοῦς, in the *Vulgate* by *solidos;* at Ezra viii. 27, the Syriac has ܕܝܢܟܘܢ, in which we can recognise at once the Greek δαρεικός. This leads us to decide in favour of the rendering *daric,* for we are warranted in attaching the greatest importance to the fact that in the *Syriac* the word is associated with the daric, which was current in the cis-Asiatic countries long after the fall of the Persian empire. To this we may add the Jewish traditions, according to which the *Adarcon,* or darcon as it is called in the Talmud, was a *Persian* gold coin (cf. *Buxtorf* lex. chald.). The historian employed the word by which the gold coin current in his time was commonly known, not with the idea that darics existed in the time of David, but to set before his readers in the most intelligible manner the magnitude of the amount contributed by the princes.—V. 8. הנמצא אתו may be thus resolved according to Gen. xliv. 9: ואיש אשר נמצא אתו *and every one with whom there was found,* but this solution does not suit either the plural, which immediately follows, אבנים, or the plural נתנו. The

suffix in אִתּוֹ, being a neuter, must be referred to the metals previously mentioned, so that we might render it "*along with it;*" אֲבָנִים is an Accusative governed by the perfect Niphal נִמְצָא, and the demonstrative הַ before the verb takes the place of the relative pronoun (cf. v. 17): *and whatever was found along with it in stones they gave, &c.* The princes of David's time, like those of the time of Moses (Ex. xxxv. 27), brought precious stones as freewill offerings. The gifts were delivered to *Jehiel*, to the Levitical family, which had been entrusted with the oversight of the treasures of the house of Jehovah (cf. chap. xxvi. 21 seq.), —V. 9. *With perfect heart;* see chap. xxviii. 9.

Vv. 10—19. *David thanks God for the readiness with which the people brought the gifts, which they had received from God, and offered them for the building of the temple.*—V. 10. *God of Israel our father;* cf. v. 18, God of Abraham . . . . our fathers, and v. 20, Jehovah the God of their fathers.—V. 11. After כִּי we must supply לְךָ: *yea to thee belongeth every thing in heaven and on earth.* From the word לְךָ we must take the pronoun אַתָּה, which is required by the last words of the verse: (thou art he *who raisest thyself as head above every thing;*) מִתְנַשֵּׂא, with a reflective signification as in Num. xvi. 3, and chap. xxiii. 24.—V. 12. מִלְּפָנֶיךָ; and the kingdom and the glory (Prov. iii. 16) come *from thee.*—V. 13. *We thank thee;* the participle with the pronoun is used in the same sense as our present; in other cases the perfect occurs with the same meaning (*e.g.*, Ps. lxxv. 2); the expression in this verse is not met with anywhere else.—V. 14. The words עָצַר כֹּחַ, *to retain strength, to have strength,* are only used in Daniel and the Chronicles (2 Chr. ii. 5, xiii. 20, xxii. 9; and in the same sense without the noun in 2 Chr. xiv. 10, xx. 37). —*And from thy hand;* equivalent to "and what has been received from thee *we have given to thee.*"—V. 15. For the first half of the verse compare Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19. *As the shadow are our days on the earth* (Job viii. 9), *there being no hope* (Ezra x. 2), of a continuance of life. V. 16. The Kethib הִיא is to be considered as a neuter: from thy hand *it is;* the Keri has the masculine הוּא agreeing with הֶהָמוֹן. V. 17. *Who are present here;* the demonstrative for the relative (v. 8, chap. xxvi. 28); the plural, who *are* found here, points back to the collective noun *people.*

Instead of the perfect we find the participle in 2 Chr. v. 11. V. 18. The accusative זאת is more precisely defined by the repeated accusative ליצר: Keep *this* for ever, namely *the imagination of the thoughts* (chap. xxviii. 9) *of the heart of thy people*, *i.e.* preserve these thoughts and this disposition, which have shown themselves in the voluntary contributions of such rich presents for thy house. In the continuation the accusative is pointed out by the *lamed* before יצר. *And established their heart unto thee;* cf. 1 Sam. vii. 3. V. 19. *And that he may do all;* viz., all thy commandments, testimonies, and statutes (chap. xxii. 13, xxviii. 7). אשר an accusative before הכינותי, *the building, which I have prepared;* in other cases (*e.g.* vv. 2 and 3) we have הכינותי לבית, and should accordingly expect to have לאשר here.

Vv. 20—25. *Conclusion of the assembly. Solomon is made king of Israel.* V. 20. *And bowed and worshipped;* in Ex. iv. 31, Gen. xliii. 28, 2 Chr. xxix. 30, Neh. viii. 6, these words are used to denote the adoration of God and prostration before him, but here they are also applied to the reverence shown to David the king (cf. 1 Kings i. 31, where the same expression occurs with reference to David). V. 21. After the solemn conclusion of the assembly, which David had convened, the people still remained together; on the following day they sacrificed as a burnt-offering *a thousand oxen, a thousand rams, a thousand sheep, with the appropriate drink-offerings*, and in addition to all this, *thank-offerings* (זבחים, in antithesis to עלות, were the sacrificial animals, which were offered as *thank-offerings*, and of which only certain portions were burned upon the altar, the priests receiving the breast and the right thigh, and the rest of the meal being eaten by the offerers and other persons invited by them) *in abundance for the whole of Israel, i.e.* every Israelite being allowed to take part in the joyous, sacrificial meal. V. 22. Those who shared in the sacrificial meal *ate and drank before Jehovah that day* (viz., on the day on which the burnt-offerings and thank-offerings were sacrificed); *then they made Solomon king a second time, and anointed him before Jehovah as prince* (1 Kings i. 35), *and Zadok* (לצדוק is an accusative, like Solomon just before) *as high priest. The second time;* the account contained in 1 Kings i., where David commands Zadok the high priest to anoint Solomon king,

and Zadok obeys this command, is very briefly referred to by the historian in chap. xxiii. 1, where he makes use of the expression, "*David made Solomon king over Israel;*" hence this is to be regarded as the *first* time, to which the historian here refers. *And anointed him;* 2 Sam. ii. 4, v. 3. The words, "*and they anointed Zadok as high priest,*" imply that under Solomon Zadok filled the office of high priest with a cheerful assent on the part of the people, and this is confirmed by a comparison of 1 Kings i. 32, ii. 26 sqq. V. 23. *On the throne of Jehovah* (cf. chap. xxviii. 5); this verse appears to be merely an expansion of 1 Kings ii. 12. V. 24. נתן יד תחת (cf. 2 Chr. xxx. 8) *to submit.* V. 25. *And he laid on him the glory of the kingdom, which had not been upon any king over Israel before him,* a singular expression, as there had been no kings *before* Solomon except Saul and David; compare on the other hand 2 Chr. i. 12, "*before thee and after thee,*" also 1 Kings iii. 12.

V. 26—30. *Conclusion of the history of David.* V. 26. *Over all Israel, vid.* chap. xi. 1, xii. 38. V. 27. Almost word for word the same as 1 Kings ii. 11. *Seven years;* according to 2 Sam. v. 5, the exact time was seven years and six months. V. 30. (The acts of David behold they are written . . . . ) *together with his kingdom, and his might and the times* (or as we might say for the sake of greater clearness together with the events of his reign) *which passed over him and over Israel and over all the kingdoms of the lands;* the kingdoms of the lands are spoken of again in 2 Chr. xii. 8, xvii. 10, xx. 29; cf. Ezra ix. 7, "the kings of the lands." By the kingdoms of the lands we are of course to understand only the kingdoms with which the Israelites under David came in contact, *e.g.* the kingdoms of Edom, Moab, and Aram Zobah.

# SECOND BOOK OF THE CHRONICLES.

## II. Chap. i.—Chap. ix.

### HISTORY OF SOLOMON.

After an account of the sacrifice in Gibeon and the appearance of God at that place (chap. i. 1—13), and after some passing notices respecting Solomon's chariots, horsemen, and riches (ch. i. 14—17), our historian proceeds at once to describe the building and consecration of the temple (chap. i. 18—vii.). Then follow some brief remarks with reference to other buildings erected by Solomon, the tributary service enforced for that purpose (chap. viii. 1—10), and the house which he built for Pharoah's daughter (v. 11); also concerning the worship of God and arrangements connected therewith (vv. 12—16); and lastly the voyage to Ophir (vv. 17, 18). The account of the visit of the queen of Sabaea forms an introduction to the description of Solomon's wealth and glory (chap. ix. 1—28), which is followed by a notice of his death and burial (vv. 29—31).

### 1. Chap. i. 1—13.

#### SOLOMON OFFERS BURNT OFFERINGS IN GIBEON; IN THE NIGHT AFTER THE SACRIFICE GOD APPEARS TO HIM.

Vv. 1—6. *The solemn procession to Gibeon, where Solomon offered sacrifice upon the altar of burnt-offering, which had been handed down from the time of Moses.* cf. 1 Kings iii. 4.—V. 1.

ויתחזק, an expression frequently met with in the Chronicles (cf. Chap. xii. 13, xiii. 21, xxi. 4); here it is followed by the words "over his kingdom," in chap. xvii. 1 by "over Israel;" *he achieved for himself a firm government over his kingdom. And Jehovah his God was with him* (a similar expression in 1 Chr. xi. 9) *and he made him very great* (cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 5, xxix. 25).—V. 2 seq. It is not expressly stated in 1 Kings iii. 4 that Solomon went to Gibeon accompanied by the princes, &c., but it is *a priori* probable that he offered his numerous sacrifices in Gibeon in the presence of his princes and in a large assembly of the people. According to the verses before us, he summoned the princes and representatives of the congregation, in the same manner as David had called them together on similar occasions (1 Chr. xiii. 1 seq., xxiii. 2, xxviii. 1). *He spake to all Israel* (namely) *to the princes of the thousands and the hundreds and to the judges and all the princes, to all Israel* (namely) *the heads of the fathers'-houses.* Before ראשי האבות we must supply *lamed* from the previous verse. The historian states emphatically, that "speaking to all Israel" meant speaking to the princes and representatives of the congregation. What Solomon said to them is not communicated; according to the context and the analogy of 1 Chr. xiii. 2 seq. we must assume that he summoned the assembled congregation to accompany him to Gibeon.— *To the high place which is in Gibeon, for here was the tabernacle of God, which Moses the servant of Jehovah had prepared in the desert* (cf. 1 Chr. v. 30—41); before this tabernacle on the high place at Gibeon, Zadok the high-priest and the priests under him fulfilled the duties of their office in accordance with the law of Moses (1 Chr. xvi. 39 seq.).—V. 4. But the ark of the covenant was not in the tabernacle, was it? *Undoubtedly* (אבל is used to confirm a statement which is made unexpectedly or likely to excite questions and doubts, chap. xix. 3, xxxiii. 17; 1 Kings i. 43) *David had brought up the ark from Kirjath-Jearim* (cf. 1 Chr. xiii. 6) *to the place which David had prepared* (instead of בַּהֵכִין לוֹ the earlier rules of the language would have required באשר הכין לו, cf. Judg. v. 27; Ruth i. 5, or בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר הכין לו, cf. 1 Kings xxi. 19; but we are not justified in taking the words just mentioned from the Book of Kings, as *Thenius*

suggests, and substituting them for the reading in the text, since the demonstrative frequently takes the place of the relative in the Chronicles (cf. 1 Chr. xxvi. 28), and we even meet with relative clauses connected directly with a preposition without any intervening pronoun, cf. 1 Chr. xv. 12), *for he had pitched a tent for it in Jerusalem* (1 Chr. xv. 1), *but* (v. 5) *the brazen altar . . . was there before the dwelling place of Jehovah*, and as this altar, which from time immemorial had been set apart for burnt-offerings, stood in Gibeon, that was the place in which according to the law burnt-offerings were to be sacrificed. As the historian here expressly states that Solomon offered the burnt offerings at the place of worship appointed in the law, he explains, on the other hand, that it was only by extraordinary events and special signs from God that David could be induced to sacrifice at the altar which he had erected on the threshing-floor of Ornan; and he also describes the manner in which David was hindered from offering his burnt sacrifice at Gibeon. *The brazen altar which Bezalel ben Uri ben Hur had made;* see Ex. xxxi. 2 and 9, where the altar of burnt-offering, *i.e.*, the brazen altar, is expressly mentioned among the things to be made by Bezalel and Oholiab (cf. chap. xxxvii. 1 and xxxviii. 1 sqq.) Instead of שָׁם most MSS. and many editions have the pointing שָׂם *he had placed;* the latter reading is adopted in the Targum and Syriac. But the former pointing is also found in many MSS. and very many editions, including most of the old ones of the 16th century; this reading was also adopted in the Septuagint and Vulgate. It is at once apparent that the reading שָׁם *thither, there,* is more suitable to the context. If the Masoretes preferred the other, they were probably induced to do so by Ex. xl. 29.—וידרשהו; the suffix does not refer to the altar, but to the word Jehovah which immediately precedes the verb (cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 30; 2 Chr. xv. 2).—V. 6. *On the brazen altar before Jehovah;* before Jehovah, because it stood before the dwelling place of Jehovah, Ex. xl. 6.—*Which belongs to the tabernacle;* the golden altar, on the other hand, belonged to the Debir, according to 1 Kings vi. 22, because its place had been assigned it in front of the Debir. אשר ל denotes here, as elsewhere, *which belongs to,* and is perfectly intelligible, although אשר לפני might be used

instead, both here and in 1 Kings vi. 22, because, as a necessary consequence of belonging to *the tabernacle* or *the debir*, the altar stood *before it.* ויעל, at the commencement of the verse, is separated from its object by several intervening words, and hence it is repeated at the end of the verse in immediate connection with the object. In verses 2—6, which have all the marks of the authorship of our historian, we have an expansion and explanation of the brief statement in 1 Kings iii. 4.

Vv. 7—12. *The appearance of God.* See the commentary on 1 Kings iii. 5—15.

V. 13. *Return to Jerusalem* (cf. 1 Kings iii. 15). Instead of לַבָּמָה, which earlier expositors accounted for on the supposition that we have an ellipsis here (*and Solomon came*, after his journey *to the height in Gibeon, to Jerusalem*), we must follow the Septuagint and Vulgate and read מֵהַבָּמָה. The words which follow ("*from before the tabernacle*") require this reading. The clause at the end of this narrative, from which we learn that "*from the height in Gibeon*" is equivalent to "*from before the tabernacle*," is added for the purpose of calling attention once more to the sacredness of the place of sacrifice in Gibeon and the legal validity of the sacrifices offered there. In the parallel passage (1 Kings iii.) it is still further stated that after Solomon's arrival in Jerusalem he offered burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and prepared a feast before the ark of the covenant. Our historian passes this over in silence, certainly not because he regarded the offerings presented on the old brazen altar of burnt-offering before the ancient tabernacle as *alone* possessing validity, for, according to his own account (1 Chr. xxi.), God himself had selected a place of sacrifice in Jerusalem as early as the time of David, and in these verses he appears to mention the tabernacle in Gibeon for the purpose of explaining to his readers what it was that induced Solomon to offer the solemn sacrifice in Gibeon and not in Jerusalem, as the precedent established by David would lead us to expect. He passes over the sacrifice in Jerusalem, and the dispute between the two women, related in 1 Kings iii. 16—28, which furnished Solomon with an opportunity of displaying the wisdom conferred upon him by God, because he was desirous of confining himself to that which had taken place at Gibeon. The narrative is brought to its proper close in

the words "*he came to Jerusalem*," which correspond to the clause in v. 3, "*they went to the high place at Gibeon.*" The further remark, "*and he reigned over Israel*," appears superfluous; in the Syriac we find "over *all* Israel," and the same words occur in 1 Kings iv. 1. It is probable that this was the original reading; the word *col* after *al* may easily have been dropped from the text. There is nothing superfluous in the remark that Solomon ruled over *all* Israel, even after the statement contained in v. 1. But it would be more appropriate to take it as the commencement of a new paragraph (vv. 14—18), which is the position assigned it in 1 Kings iv. It was probably connected with the thirteenth verse on the occasion of the division of the verses, in consequence of the word ויאסף (v. 14) being regarded as the opening of a fresh verse and section, as in 1 Kings x. 26.

## 2. Chap. i. 14—17.

### SOLOMON'S CHARIOTS, HORSEMEN, AND WEALTH.

We find these verses almost word for word in 1 Kings x. 26—29; see the commentary on that passage.

## 3. Chap. ii.—vii.

### THE BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE AND OTHER THINGS CONNECTED WITH IT.

Chap. ii. 1—17. *Preparations for the building of the temple.*

Chap. ii., v. 1. ויאמר, *and Solomon commanded*, is followed by the infinitive with *lamed: that they should build*, cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 17. The temple is called *a house for the name of Jehovah*, because his name, *i.e.*, He himself, dwelt in the temple with that majesty and holiness, which are most concisely designated His Name (Deut. xxviii. 58; 2 Chr. xx. 8, 9). The *house for his kingdom*, the royal palace, is merely mentioned incidentally in the Chronicles, here and at chap. ii. 11, vii. 11, viii. 1; we have

full particulars respecting the erection of it in 1 Kings vii. 1—12. We agree in the main with the result of Thenius' enquiries, that the greater part of this palace was on the higher plateau of Zion, on its north-eastern side, and that the eastern side of the palace was opposite to the western side of the temple.

V. 2. The statements contained in this verse we meet with again at v. 18, where they are repeated in close connection with v. 17. The historian evidently did not strictly confine himself to his original sources. He introduced at this point a remark which occurred later in the sources themselves, and afterwards copied them more fully, thus repeating what he had already written. See. vv. 17 and 18.

Vv. 3—16. *Negotiations with Huram king of Tyre.*—Vv. 3—10. Solomon first applies to Huram (differently narrated in 1 Kings v.) in writing, as we may infer from v. 11.—V. 3. The name *Huram* only occurs in the Chronicles; in 1 Kings v. 15 he is called *Hiram*, in vii. 40 and other places *Hirom*. Hirom appears to resemble most closely the original form, as we find the same name written *Εἴρωμος* in *Menander*, as quoted by *Josephus* (c. Apion i. 18, 21), for which *Σίρωμος* occurs in *Herodotus* 7, 98 and Syncellus p. 344 Ed. Bonn. *Josephus* himself writes *Εἴραμος* (Antiq. viii. 2).—The words *to build him a house* occur again in 1 Chr. xiv. 1. The expression "*as thou didst deal &c.*" requires another clause, which should read thus: *deal also with me*, but these words can easily be supplied from the context, especially from v. 6, though the Vulgate translators have thought it necessary to interpolate, *sic fac mecum.*—V. 4. *To consecrate it* (the temple) *to him, i.e.*, to make it קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוה, Lev. xxvii. 14. The expression is more closely defined by the following infinitive: for the purpose *of burning incense*, &c. The *sweet smelling incense* (Ex. xxv. 6) was the regular incense, that was burned every morning and every evening (Ex. xxx. 7 seq.) The מערכת תמיד was *laid* on the table of showbread (cf. Ex. xxv. 30), hence the infinitive לְהַקְטִיר does not refer to the continual offering of the showbread. The *lamed* alone must be applied to the latter part of the sentence, thus: for *the continual offering and for the burnt sacrifice*. Burnt sacrifices had to be offered every morning and evening, and in addition to this continual burnt-offering special sacrifices were offered according to the law on

the Sabbaths, the new moons, and the feast days (Num. xxviii. and xxix.). The concluding words remind us of the well known formula "for a statute for ever" (*e.g.* Num. xix. 10); they are quite loosely connected, and form a sentence by themselves: *for all time this is enjoined upon Israel.* Earlier expositors interpreted the sentence in its present connexion as meaning: it is therefore important to build a fixed and permanent temple, because the sacrificial worship therein is to last for ever, and therefore I require building materials; but in this explanation they laid too much stress upon so loosely constructed a clause; compare the similar words in 1 Chr. xxiii. 31. V. 5. In 1 Chr. xxix. 1 all that was said was, the temple must be great, because it is not for man but for God; but here the reason is still more strongly expressed: it must be great, because it is intended for the God, who is greater than all gods (Ex. xviii. 11). V. 6. *Who is able;* cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 14. The words "*for the heaven and the heaven of heavens do not contain him,*" are a reminiscence of 1 Kings viii. 27, and 2 Chr. vi. 18, where we find the sentence appropriately completed thus: *to say nothing of this house which I have built.* In the question "*Who am I, that I should build him a house*" (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 14) there is implied: a house for him to dwell in I cannot build; and with this is connected the antithesis: *but only for the purpose of burning incense before him, i.e.,* only to maintain a place in which God may be honoured by sacrifice, can I venture to build him a house. V. 7. The *wise man to work in gold,* &c., who is asked for here, is afterwards sent by King Huram (v. 11). The works of art and instruments prepared by this artificer are described in chap. iv. 11—16; but we do not find any mentioned in this list for which *purple cloth, crimson stuff,* or *blue purple* were required. *Purple stuff;* ארגון, equivalent to ארגמן v. 13, Ex. xxv. 4, was the usual form adopted in later times and in the Aramaean dialect, Dan. v. 7, 16, 29. *Crimson;* כרמיל was certainly not originally a Hebrew word; it was probably current among the Persians and Armenians, and came from them to the Hebrews along with the material to which it was applied; (cf. Gesenius thes. p. 714). *Blue purple,* frequently mentioned in Exodus, *e.g.* Chap. xxvi. 31. In 1 Kings vii. 13 the artificer is merely said to have been a worker in brass. If at the same time the various kinds of cloth are

mentioned, which were used in preparing the curtains in the temple, this is done simply for the purpose of comprising in one list all the costly materials which were required for the temple and its furniture. But we obtain the further information here, that the artist employed himself in weaving, which is not mentioned in the other passages. לפתח פתוחים, *to prepare carved ornaments*, see 1 Kings vi. 18, 23, 29. According to 1 Kings vii. 13, 2 Chr. iv. 11—16, the artist did not work in wood. Before עם החכמים (with the wise men) the infinitives לעשות and לפתח must be repeated thus: *that he may work*, &c. *along with the wise* men, &c. For the last words of the verse see 1 Chr. xxii. 15, xxviii. 21.—V. 8. For אלגומים, here and chap. ix. 10 seq., we find אלמגים in 1 Kings x. 11; the word denotes the genuine sandal-wood, which is said in the passages cited to have come to Palestine from the land of Ophir; according to 1 Kings v. 20 and 22, Hiram sent from Lebanon only cedar and cypress wood; the author of the Chronicles mentions in connexion with these the third valuable wood, which is also noticed in 1 Kings x. 12, as employed in the building of the temple, but which did not come from Lebanon. The last half of the verse corresponds very closely to the words of Solomon as reported in 1 Kings v. 20.—Ver. 9. The infinitive ולהכין cannot be regarded as a continuation of the words, *to cut*, in v. 8; it is rather connected with the imperative "send me" in v. 8, meaning "*and they shall prepare for me*;" on this use of the infinitive with *lamed* see 1 Chr. xxii. 5. והפלא, the infinitive absolute in this passage has the meaning of an adverb, *wonderfully*, cf. *Ewald*, Lehrbuch 280 c.—V. 10. The word לחטבים, which does not occur anywhere else in the Chronicles (cf. Josh. ix. 21, 23, 27), is explained by לכרתי העצים (the *lamed* is the introductory prefix); *and behold, as for the hewers, who cut down the trees, I give* (the perfect as in 1 Chr. xxix. 3) *wheat for food for thy servants*, viz. for those who were employed in felling trees (cf. *thy servants* in v. 7, and 1 Kings v. 20). מכות is quite unintelligible; the explanation *wheat of strokes*, or wheat that is beaten, threshed, cannot be correct, for the reference here is to measured wheat, which must necessarily have been threshed; nor can it be rendered, *wheat for strokes*, in other words for the felling of the trees, for מכות is connected with חטים in the

absolute state. According to 1 Kings v. 25 the reading should be מַכֹּלֶת (contracted from מַאֲכֹלֶת *food*); by mistake a *vav* was substituted for *lamed*, and hence the original word was changed into the reading of our text. For the *twenty kors of oil*, mentioned in 1 Kings v., we should read according to this passage *twenty thousand baths of oil*. There are also various other respects in which the account given here differs from that of 1 Kings v. 25. There it is arranged by treaty that Solomon shall give Hiram every year 20,000 kors of wheat, and 20,000 baths of oil, here we read of only one delivery; there the delivery is intended for *the house* of King Hiram, here it is said to have been applied to the maintenance of the wood-cutters.—(*Bertheau* regards these as discrepancies, not so *Keil* who says (p. 218, 219): "these differences show clearly that the two accounts contain partial extracts from more ancient sources, for they are not at variance with each other. . . . There is no discrepancy between the statement of the Chronicles, that Solomon promised to give to the people of Hiram 20,000 kors of wheat, &c., and that of Kings, that Hiram requested provisions for the maintenance of his court, and received them from Solomon every year; the two passages treat of different things, and each is the complement of the other, as most expositors have already observed (cf. *J. H. Michaelis* adnott. uberr. ad 2 Chr. ii. 9, and *Schulz* Schol. ad 1 Reg. v. 11). *Studuit uterque scriptor sacer*, says Michaelis, *ut lectori hoc insinuaret. Hinc scriptor libri Regum expresse addit*, 20,000 *illos coros tritici, et* 20 *coros olei concessos fuisse Chiramo pro domo sive familia ejus regia alenda. Scriptor vero libri Chron. triticum, hordeum, vinum ac oleum data dicit servis Hirami, et ne quis per servos aulicos ejus intelligat, addit caesoribus, ne hoc tantum, sed praeterea, excidentibus ligna, ut non possimus commode intelligere, nisi eos, qui in ipso Libano laborabant.* Solomon had promised to give to the Tyrian workmen the provisions mentioned in the Chronicles; in addition to this Hiram required in return for the cedars, which he sent him, a *yearly* supply of wine and oil for his court, and according to the book of Kings Solomon delivered it." *Keil Chron.* p. 218, 219).—Vv. 12—16. King Hiram's answer. V. 11. *Because Jehovah loved his people*, &c.; Similar words occur in chap. ix. 8; 1 Kings x. 9.—V. 12. The fresh commencement וַיֹּאמֶר "*and he said*" may be explained from

the fact that in 1 Kings v. 21 the word is also found at the opening of a clause, which corresponds pretty closely with the words of the verse before us.—V. 13. ידע בינה, 1 Chr. xii. 32. The *lamed* before *Huram* is the sign of the Accusative; the name of the artist is given in 1 Kings vii. 13 as *Hiram*, for which we have here *Huram*, just as King Hiram is called Huram in the Chronicles, cf. v. 2 of this chapter. The king calls the artist *my father;* father is here to be taken in the sense of master, as we may see from 2 Chr. iv. 16, where Huram is called the father of Solomon, because he was engaged as master in Solomon's service and prepared for him different works of art. Compare the word father in Gen. xlv. 8.—V. 14. According to 1 Kings vii. 14 the mother of the artist was a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, whereas in the passage before us she is said to have belonged to the daughters of Dan, *i.e.*, to the tribe of Dan. In order to reconcile these different statements early scholars, following *Kimchi* and other Rabbins, have maintained that in 1 Kings it is Hiram himself, and not his mother who is said to have belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, and that the actual state of the case accordingly was, that through his father he was connected with the tribe of Naphtali, whilst his mother belonged to the tribe of Dan. When the father is called a man of Tyre, the reason of this is said to have been simply that he lived in Tyre and was employed as an artist there. This explanation served also to remove the offence, which was taken by the Jews of a later age, at the Tyrian descent of the maker of the sacred vessels. But in 1 Kings it is clearly stated that he was the son of a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, and just as clearly is it stated both there and in the verse before us that he was a Tyrian man, *i.e.*, that Tyre was his native place, for the two expressions "*of the tribe of Naphtali*" (or "*of the daughters of Dan*"), and "*a Tyrian man*," are placed side by side as both indicative of the home and descent alone. *Thenius* thinks it possible to reconcile the different accounts of Huram thus: "he was the son of a Tyrian, who had married an Israelitish widow of the city of Dan in the tribe of Naphtali (which was very near to the city of Tyre)." But we know of no city of Dan in the province of Naphtali, and we certainly are not warranted in assuming the existence of such a city for the purpose of explain-

ing how the mother of Huram could belong to the daughters of Dan and be at the same time a Naphtalite. The question, whether we are justified in expecting exact historical statements in both passages, we have no hesitation in answering in the affirmative, since the person referred to was a celebrated man, about whom the Israelites, who had occasion to admire his works of art, must necessarily have been anxious to possess exact information. We must therefore attempt to unite these apparently discrepant accounts, since there is no reason to question the accuracy of either. Now it seems to us an important point, that the mother is called in 1 Kings a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, whereas in the Chronicles it is merely said that she belonged to the daughters of Dan. The two accounts are related to each other in the following manner: she was by birth a Danite, married into the tribe of Naphtali, became a widow, and as a widow of the tribe of Naphtali became the wife of a man of Tyre, by whom she had a son Huram. Thus could two of the tribes of Israel boast that on the mother's side Huram belonged to them. איש צרי, Septuagint *ἀνὴρ Τύριος*; צרי has been changed by *Josephus* (Antiq. 8. 3. 4) into "*Urias of an Israelitish family*," an alteration which can be traced to the desire to make Huram a man of purely Israelitish descent. יודע must be referred to Huram, for he was the skilful man for whom Solomon had just applied (v. 7). The skill of Huram, according to the verse before us, embraced working in *stone* and *wood*, and also the manufacture of *byssus*, articles not named in v. 7. The words "*to invent all kinds of clever devices*," here used to describe the skill of Huram, resemble Ex. xxxi. 4, cf. xxxv. 33. *Which are given to him* (*sc.*, to execute). The concluding words, "*along with thy wise men and the wise men of my lord David*" (cf. v. 7) are connected with the three infinitives, "*to work*," "*to grave*," and "*to invent*." By calling David, "*my lord*," king Huram politely places himself on a level with David's subjects (cf. 2 Sam. xvi. 9; 1 Kings i. 31).—V. 15 cf. 10. V. 16. *According to all thy need;* צרכך is found nowhere else in the Old Testament, but is frequently met with in the Aramæan writings, *e.g.*, the Targums (cf. *Buxtorf*, lex. chald. talmud. rabb.). The word רפסדות also occurs in this passage alone; in 1 Kings v. 23 we have דברות, which removes all doubt as to the meaning: *we will*

*convey the wood to thee in floats* (*raphsodoth* is a loosely connected accusative, explanatory of the mode of conveyance); we cannot succeed in finding any satisfactory etymology of this peculiar word. *To Joppa,* the nearest harbour to Jerusalem in the Mediterranean Sea; the name of the place is not given in 1 Kings v. 23. The letter of King Huram, as we have it here in v. 10—15, differs in many respects from the words of Huram in 1 Kings v. 21—23; at the same time it is very evident that the two passages relate to the same negotiations between the two kings. (See the commentary on the passage in Kings—Tr.). *Josephus* (Antiq. 8. 2. 6 seq.) also communicates the correspondence between Solomon and Hiram. The contents of these letters agree so exactly with the statements in 1 Kings v. that they must be regarded as freely worked up from the chapter in question. *Josephus* also says (Ant. 8. 2. 8.) that the *ἀντίγραφα* of the letters are not only to be found in the historical books of the Old Testament, but were still preserved in his day in the public archives of Tyre; but his words must not be taken in their strict literality so far as the Old Testament is concerned, since he does not give the letters in the form in which we have them there. And from this we may conclude, that his meaning is not that the letters still existed word for word in the Tyrian archives, but that accounts of the negotiations between Solomon and the King of Tyre were preserved in the Tyrian records in the same manner as in the Old Testament. There is no reason to question the credibility of this statement. "The letters from *Eupolemus* given by *Eusebius* (praepar. evang. ix. 33, 34) are evidently free compositions," *Thenius* on 1 Kings v. 23.

Vv. 17, 18. Recapitulation of the brief account in v. 1 (cf. 1 Kings v. 29 seq.). V. 17. "*All the foreigners;*" viz., the Canaanites, who lived in the midst of Israel (cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 2). *According to the numbering* (*sephar* only occurs in this passage) *wherewith David his father had numbered them;* in 1 Chr. xxii. 2 it is merely stated that David gave orders to *gather together* the foreigners, but as the object for which these foreigners were ordered to be collected together was that workmen might be obtained for the building of the temple, it is probable that this is the passage referred to here, and that this assembling of the foreigners in the time of David is what the author describes as

the first numbering. With this he now compares the second numbering in the time of Solomon. Moreover, it is evident, from the brief notice in 2 Sam. xx. 24, that in David's time the foreigners were obliged to perform tributary service under the superintendence of an officer, Adoram or Adoniram, and such regular service could not be carried out without a definite organisation and numbering of those who served. The number 153,600 is the sum total of the different numbers given in the next verse, 70,000, 80,000 and 3,600; hence the overseers were not included in this amount.—V. 18. The numbers 70,000 and 80,000 we meet with in v. 1, and 1 Kings v. 29. From a comparison with 1 Chr. xxii. 2 it is evident, that the seventy thousand *hewers on the mountain* were appointed to cut the stones for the building. According to *Thenius*, "*on the mountain*" meant on Mount Lebanon, but there is no intimation that this is intended even in 1 Kings v. 29 sqq., and it may be assumed at the outset, that at least the greater part of the stones used in the buildings at Jerusalem were procured from quarries in the neighbourhood; "*on the mountain*" is quite indefinite, and is merely equivalent to "at the quarries in the mountains." The word מנצחים, denoting the overseers of the tributary labourers, is only met with in the Chronicles (here and v. 1, compare 2 Chr. xxxiv. 13). The number 3600 given here and at v. 1 is undoubtedly exact; $3600 \times 50 = 180{,}000$, the number which we obtain by adding to the 70,000 bearers of burdens and the 80,000 stone cutters the 30,000 tributary labourers mentioned in 1 Kings v. 27, who were employed in cutting wood upon the Lebanon. Thus there would be an overseer to every fifty men, which is clearly a very just proportion. The number 3300 given in 1 Kings v. 16 stands in no such relation to the whole number. *To keep the people at work*, an expression which is not found in the parallel passage in Kings (cf. Ex. vi. 5).—If we substitute 3600 for 3300, according to the account contained in this passage, the numbers given in 1 Kings v. 15, 16 correspond to those given here; but it is strange that nothing is said in this passage of the 30,000 hewers of wood mentioned in 1 Kings v. 13, especially as the number of the overseers, 3600, seems to have been fixed with reference to the whole number, including these 30,000. We cannot tell for what reason they are omitted here. On the

relation between the account given in these verses, and that contained in 1 Kings ix. 15—23, 2 Chr. viii. 7—10, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Chap. iii. 1—14. *The building of the temple.* Vv. 15—17. *The two pillars.*

Chap. iv. 1—10. *The holy things and the forecourts.* Vv. 11—18. *List of the brazen articles made by Huram.* Vv. 19—22. *The articles of gold.*

Chap. v. 1. *Conclusion of the account of the preparation of the holy things.*

Chap. v. 2—vii. 10. *Consecration of the temple.*

(For chap. iii. 1—vii. 10 the reader is referred to the Commentary on 1 Kings vi.—viii.—Tr.)

## 4. Chap. viii. and ix.

### BRIEF NOTICES OF IMPORTANT EVENTS IN SOLOMON'S REIGN, ACCOUNT OF HIS WISDOM, HIS WEALTH, AND HIS POWER. HIS DEATH.

Vv. 1, 2. *Solomon peopled the cities, which Huram had given him, with Israelites;* compare 1 Kings ix. 10—14, where it is stated that Huram not only furnished Solomon with materials, but also assisted him with money (no doubt for the purpose of completing the great buildings), and that Solomon gave him in return twenty small cities in the neighbourhood of Tyre and its territory. Our historian says nothing about the assistance with gold, or the cities which Solomon gave to Huram; but speaks, on the other hand, of cities which Huram gave up to Solomon, and which the latter peopled with Israelites. Attempts were made in very early times to reconcile these two accounts. It was assumed that Solomon gave twenty cities to Huram, and that, as they did not seem to him a sufficient compensation, he gave them back to Solomon, who then peopled them with Israelites. This is the opinion expressed by Josephus (Antiq. 8. 5. 3). Jewish commentators *(e.g. Kimchi)* have conjectured that, in order to strengthen the alliance between Solomon and Huram, the former gave to the latter twenty cities, and Huram

again gave up to Solomon twenty others. In this way the earlier Christian commentators have combined the two. But it should be proved that the two accounts refer to different transactions, and this proof it would be difficult to furnish, as it is evident from a comparison of the accounts in the Book of Kings and the Chronicles, and their position in the two books, that the different statements rest upon the same original foundation. (*Keil* says, p. 221, 222:—"however contradictory the two accounts may appear at the first glance, the contradiction is only apparent and is removed by the remark that the one author relates what the other has omitted. Hiram had assisted Solomon with timber and gold. In return Solomon, as soon as his buildings were completed, gave up twenty cities which were under his dominion but were not inhabited by Israelites. Hiram went to look at them, but they did not please him. (So far 1 Kings ix. 11—13). He therefore gave them back to Solomon, who finished building them (for they were probably in very bad condition, and therefore did not please Hiram) and sent Israelites to dwell in them.[1] In this way *J. D. Michaelis*, in his notes on 2 Chr. viii. 2, has combined the two passages (cf. *Dahler* p. 86 *note a*). Still *Gramberg* pronounces them hopelessly irreconcileable, and says that there is something more than inconsistency in the statement of the author of the Chronicles, v. 2: that Solomon built the cities, &c., since it is impossible to tell how cities could be *built*, that were already in existence. But this remark does not indicate much shrewdness, for it presupposes, first of all, that nothing has happened in the world except the few events which have been recorded in history, and moreover it seems to show that *Gramberg* was ignorant of the fact that *banah* means also to *build up again, to finish building, restituere, instaurare, exstruere*, &c., meanings which may be found in every *lexicon*.")—V. 1. The time mentioned in 1 Kings is the same as that given here. The twenty years must be reckoned from the period when the building commenced. This statement is in harmony with the notices in 1 Kings vi. 38 (the temple was finished seven years after the commencement of the building) and with that in chap. vii. 1 (he

[1] On the situation of these cities see Ritter's Erdkunde B. 2 p. 384. This learned geographer also explains the two accounts in the manner indicated above, without discovering any discrepancy between them.

was building his own house thirteen years) cf. 2 Chr. v. 2.—*And his house*, cf. chap. i. 18.—V. 2. *The building* (according to v. 4 sqq. 1 Kings ix. 17 and other similar passages) must be understood as meaning the fortification of the cities. *And caused Israelites to dwell* (removed them) *thither*, 2 Kings xvii. 6.

Vv. 3—6. *The cities which Solomon built* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 17—19).—V. 3. The account of the conquest of the city, and, as appears from v. 4, of the kingdom of Hamath, whose king approached David in a friendly manner, and apparently ensured his independence by that means (cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 9—11), we find in this passage only. That the kingdom of Hamath was conquered by the Israelites is evident from 2 Kings xiv. 28; but this is the only passage in which we are informed that it was conquered by Solomon. On the name *Hamath Zobah* see 1 Chr. xviii. 3, 9.—*He went to* Hamath (sc. for the purpose of conquering it) cf. 2 Sam. xii. 29. חזק על is used in other passages to denote the conquest of countries or nations (chap. xxvii. 5; Dan. xi. 5).—V. 4. The building of Tadmor and all the store-cities in the land of Hamath is evidently connected with the conquest of the land of Hamath by Solomon, for after he had conquered this land he built Tadmor and the cities in the land of Hamath. From this, indeed, it does not follow that Tadmor was situated in the land of Hamath, but we may infer from the context that a connection was established with Tadmor through the conquest of Hamath, and thus the territory of Tadmor acquired greater importance for the Israelites. Hence we must look for Tadmor or Tammor (1 Kings ix. 18 Keri) outside Palestine, and somewhere towards the north-east. The identity of Tadmor (Tammor is certainly the original genuine Hebrew name, Tadmor a later Aramaean form) and Palmyra, which is established by tradition, is thus still farther confirmed. Palmyra was situated on the great line of traffic between the coast district of Palestine and Thapsakos on the Euphrates, and from its position became a very important place in connection with the traffic in the cis-Asiatic countries. It was *in the desert*, which stretches from Damascus to Thapsakos, in the centre of a fertile and well-watered plain, and was therefore very suitable for a place of call. In 1 Kings ix. 18 the name Tammor occurs in such a place in the list of cities mentioned there, as to suggest the notion that

the city referred to was in the south of Palestine, and therefore not Palmyra (*Thenius*); but the brief notice in the Book of Kings "*and Tammor in the desert in the land*," is evidently merely a supplementary remark, for an explanation of which we must look to the more complete account in the Chronicles. That the same city is referred to is evident from the definition במדבר, "*in the desert*," and we are led to conjecture that the words "*in the land*" are the remains of a longer sentence, which could be completed from the passage before us in the following manner: "and all the store cities which he built *in the land*," namely in Hamath. As the words "*and all the store-cities*" occur again in the next verse, they might easily have been overlooked the first time. According to 2 Chr. xxxii. 28 *the store-cities* were places for collecting stores of provisions; when they were situated on the great trade-roads they were no doubt intended to relieve the wants of travellers and their beasts of burden.—V. 5. In 1 Kings ix. 17 lower Beth-horon only is mentioned. On the sites of the two Beth-horons see 1 Chr. vii. 24. ערי מצור must be regarded as a second accusative to the verb *banah: he built them as fortified towns* (chap. xi. 5); the words which follow are in apposition, and are added by way of explanation, namely, *as walls, gates, and bars* (cf. chap. xiv. 6).—V. 6. *Baalath* (1 Kings ix. 18) was a city in the tribe of Dan, Josh. xix. 44. It is appropriately named in connection with the fortified cities of Beth-horon, which were also to the west of Jerusalem. By the *store-cities* mentioned here we are to understand all, with the exception of those in Hamath, which had already been noticed in v. 4, but especially the store-cities in the land of Palestine. The *chariot-cities;* cf. chap. i. 14. In the other passages (chap. i. 14, ix. 25; 1 Kings x. 26) the cities of the horsemen are not specially mentioned, but the chariot-cities are described as stations for horsemen as well as for chariots. חשק, as distinguished from the fortresses and store-cities, can only mean *pleasure-buildings.* —*And on the Lebanon* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 19).—It is worthy of note, that nothing is said in this passage about the fortification of Jerusalem, nor are the cities of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer named among the fortresses erected by Solomon (1 Kings ix. 15); the account of the conquest of Gezer by Pharaoh is also omitted (1 Kings ix. 16); cf. v. 11 below.

Vv. 7—10. *The institution of tributary service.* (See the commentary on 1 Kings ix. 20—23).—The question arises here, in what relation does the statement contained in these verses and in 1 Kings ix. 20—23 stand to the account given in 2 Chr. ii. 2 and 17, 18, and 1 Kings v. 27—32? If we had only to deal with 1 Kings v. 29—32, we should be warranted in saying without hesitation, that in this passage the reference is to labourers, who were taken from the midst of Israel and required to perform the less arduous work, and that in 1 Kings ix. 20 seq. and the passage before us on the other hand the Canaanitish tributary labourers are intended; but with this we could not reconcile 2 Chr. ii. 16, where it is expressly stated, that the labourers, the number of whom is given in 1 Kings v. 29 seq., were *foreigners in the land of the Israelites*, and therefore of Canaanitish origin. Still on comparing the different accounts still further, the conclusion to which we are brought is, that two different classes of labourers are distinguished. *First*, those who were bound to render tributary service, and who belonged to the Canaanitish tribes. They are called מס or מס־עבד, and are referred to in 1 Kings v. 13, 14, where "*from all Israel*" must mean *out of the whole of the land of Israel*, and not from the midst of the Israelites in contrast to the Canaanites, and also in 1 Kings ix. 20—23 and 2 Chr. viii. 7—10. There were thirty thousand of these, and 550 (according to the Chronicles 250) overseers were appointed to superintend them. Now, if we reckon fifty labourers to each overseer (cf. 2 Chr. ii. 17, 18) this would give us 27,500 labourers, a number which approaches very nearly to the 30,000 mentioned in Kings. *Secondly*, the Israelitish labourers, who were bearers of burdens and stone-cutters. They are noticed in 1 Kings v. 29—32 and 2 Chr. ii. 17, 18. These labourers are never called מס, and when we read in the Chronicles that they also were foreigners, whereas no such statement appears in 1 Kings v. 15—18, we are led to conclude that the two classes of labourers have not been kept distinct. The very general remark in 1 Kings ix. 22 and 2 Chr. viii. 9, where the great distinction between the Israelites and Canaanites is pointed out, and Solomon is said to have made none of the sons of Israel *servants*, refers to the fact, that no one was taken from the midst of the Israelites to perform tributary service, because Israel was

the ruling nation (the Israelites were *men of war, princes, chariot-soldiers,* &c.), but this did not prevent the employment of the Israelites as workmen, *e.g.*, bearers of burdens and stone-cutters.

V. 11. *The daughter of Pharaoh takes possession of the palace which Solomon built for her.* Compare 1 Kings ix. 24, where the event is but briefly referred to, though the notices in chap. iii. 1 and ix. 16 had already prepared the way. Hitherto the author of the Chronicles has not mentioned Pharaoh's daughter, nor have we any account of the conquest of the city of Gezer by Pharaoh, who gave it to his daughter as her dowry. And here he merely observes in a very cursory manner, when speaking of the buildings, that Solomon also built a house for Pharaoh's daughter, because he regarded it as improper that a woman should live in the house of David, "*for they are holy* (the plural must refer to the different rooms in David's house) *because the ark of Jehovah had come to them.*" According to 1 Kings iii. 1, Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter into the city of David, that is, no doubt, into the palace which was formerly inhabited by his father and after his death by himself, that she might dwell there till he had completed his other buildings and *his own house.* Hence the queen was afterwards to live in his own house, from which it follows, that "*the house which he had built for her*" formed part of Solomon's own house, a portion, that is, of his royal palace. The statement in 1 Kings iii. 1 requires the information in chap. ix. 24 to render it complete. We have then in the Book of Kings a full account of the entrance of the king's daughter into the house which Solomon had built for her.—The Pharaoh referred to here was *Psusennes,* the last king of the twenty-first dynasty (the Tanitic).—In 1 Kings ix. 24, the words "*Solomon built Millo then*" follow immediately upon the account of the house for Pharaoh's daughter; but they are omitted by our historian.

Vv. 12—16. *Solomon's sacrifices and the rest of the offerings are presented on the altar which he had built; the priests and Levites are appointed according to David's plan.* From the position of these words they answer to 1 Kings ix. 25, the obscure statements of that verse being partly explained, or rather paraphrased, and partly completed by the addition of farther particulars.—V. 12. The point of time indicated in the word "*then*" refers to the period immediately following the completion and consecration

of the temple, and the meaning is, as the next verse clearly shows, that from this time forth the sacrificial worship prescribed by Moses was regularly maintained and offered in the new temple. The emphasis is laid not upon the fact that Solomon offered burnt-sacrifices, but upon their being offered *on the altar which he had built.* In 1 Kings ix. 25 the meaning of the words (with the exception of the last three) is that the sacrifices, presented by Solomon on the three great festivals, were offered on the altar which he had built; the Chronicles in the following verse emphatically state that all the sacrifices were offered there.—V. 13. The בְּ in בִּדְבַר is difficult to understand; דְּבַר alone, as in Lev. xxiii. 37, would be more intelligible; but the *beth* is found in all the MSS. It must therefore be rendered: *they had to offer burnt-sacrifices with that which was appointed for every day, i.e.*, they had to offer the burnt-sacrifices appointed for every day. On the infinitive לְהַעֲלוֹת see for example 1 Chr. ix. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 2. *On the Sabbaths and on the new moons and on the feasts, three times a year;* the plural מוֹעֲדִים embraces under one term the three great feasts mentioned immediately afterwards (cf. *Hitzig* Ezek. xlvi. 10). The person sacrificing is not noticed, since reference is made to the sacrifices of the congregation, which were prescribed by the law, and the emphasis is again laid upon the fact that *from that time forth* they were offered upon the altar, which Solomon had built. V. 14. *He appointed* (carrying out David's arrangements) *the twenty-four divisions of priests* (1 Chr. xxiv.) *for their service, and he appointed the Levites to their charges to praise* (cf. 1 Chr. xxv. 3) *and to perform service before the priests* (1 Chr. xxiii. 28 sqq.) *according to the regulation for every day,* and he appointed *the door-keepers,* &c. (1 Chr. xxvi. 1—19). On the last words see Neh. xii. 24.—V. 15. The verb סוּר with the accusative of the object, meaning *to depart from the command,* does not occur any where else, we find סוּר מִן in every other passage, and a few MSS. have this construction here. It does not seem to me improbable, that this was the construction originally intended here, and that the *mem* was dropped from mimmazoth for the sake of euphony. *With reference to all things* (especially) *with reference to the treasures,* (1 Chr. xxvi. 20—28); *i.e.* those

which had not been mentioned in the previous verse.—V. 16. *The whole of the work of Solomon was prepared, i.e.* was completed (cf. chap. xxix. 35, xxxv. 10, 16) *to this day;* what day is meant we learn from the context, according to which we can only think of the day, when the execution of David's plans brought the activity of David in connexion with the temple to a close. The מלאכת relates simply to the temple; this is clearly shown in the words which follow in apposition: the whole work, namely, from *the foundation of the temple and up to its completion. The house of Jehovah is completed;* with this postscript the author brings to a close the entire narrative from chap. i. 18 to this passage, the building of the temple is the principal subject, other things being only incidentally named. It must be borne in mind that these words correspond to the last three words of 1 Kings ix. 25; we remark too here in passing that we find no reference in the passage in Kings to any high-priestly functions exercised by Solomon.

Vv. 17, 18. *Voyage to Ophir* (cf. 1 Kings ix. 26—28). V. 17. Instead of הַיָּם we have in 1 Kings יַם סוּף *on the shore of the Red Sea in the land of Edom.*—V. 18. According to 1 Kings Hiram sent his servants in the fleet along with the servants of Solomon, but according to the account in this verse he sent "by the hands of his servants ships and servants, and they went to Ophir along with the servants of Solomon." We find it difficult to explain how an Israelitish man can have pictured Hiram sending ships from Tyre to Ezion-geber, since they can hardly have been conveyed by land across the isthmus of Suez, and the circumnavigation of Africa for that purpose is incredible, yet it is evident that this is the meaning of the historian's words, and that he saw no difficulty in the way of its accomplishment at the time when he wrote. (Keil says: "Tyrian ships could reach the Red Sea if they sailed round Africa. In favour of the supposition that they did so we might adduce the account, given by *Herodotus* [l. iv. 42] and defended by *Heeren* with most conclusive arguments [Ideen i. 2. p. 79 sqq. 4th ed.], that Necho sent out Phœnician sailors who circumnavigated Africa. It is true Herodotus says that he knows Necho to have been the first to prove that Africa is entirely surrounded by water with the exception of the small isthmus that connects it with Asia, and thus

seems to imply, that previously this had not been known; but he also says that Necho instructed the Phœnician sailors to start from the Arabian Sea, and return to Egypt by coming through the Pillars of Hercules into the Northern [Mediterranean] Sea, and from this the contrary might be inferred, so that we cannot argue with any certainty from this account of Herodotus that the Phœnicians had not sailed round Africa before. We admit that there are no historical records of such voyages, but the Phœnicians, from commercial considerations, purposely threw a veil of secrecy over their more distant expeditions [vid *Heeren* ut. sup. p. 27 sqq., 55.] Huët[1] and Michaelis [spicil. i. p. 99 sqq.], though for different reasons, have both assumed the circumnavigation of Africa in the time of Solomon. But if the Phœnicians had really already undertaken this voyage, they would certainly have made it frequently, and in that case it could hardly have remained a secret. If, however, any should assume, that it was only occasionally, or under Solomon, that they sent a fleet round Africa into the Arabian Sea, to trade in this gulf, they could have attained their object much more easily by conveying their vessels into the Red Sea over the isthmus of Suez. In ancient times it was so well-known and frequent a plan to transport ships and even whole fleets across isthmuses and tracts of country, in order to take them from one sea to another, that there is no difficulty in such a supposition. Thus *Herodotus* relates [vii. 24], that Xerxes had the isthmus of Mount Athos cut through, merely to show his power and leave a memorial of it behind him, as he could have conveyed the ships over the isthmus without any great difficulty. *Wesseling* also adduces a statement from *Polyan* [strateg. v. 26] to the effect that Dionysius of Sicily made his soldiers carry eighty triremes a distance of half-a-mile in one day. According to *Thucydides* [iv. 8] the Peloponnesians conveyed eighty ships across the Leucadian isthmus. *Arrian* says that Alexander had ships transported from the Indus into the Hydaspes, and from Phœnicia into the Euphrates [Book v. and vii.]. Cleopatra wanted to have her whole fleet conveyed from the Mediterranean Sea to the Arabian Gulf; and was only pre-

[1] Comment. sur les navigations de Salomon, in his "traités" geographiques et historiques, t. ii. à la Haye 1730.

vented by the Arabians, who burnt the ships that were first drawn on land [see *Plutarch* vit. Ant.]. Further examples are mentioned by Diodorus Siculus iv. 56, Ammian. Marcellus xxiv. 7, and Huët, p. 40 sqq. It was evidently in this manner that the Tyrians under Hiram conveyed their ships into the Arabian Gulf, that they might sail with Solomon's vessels to Ophir and take part in the trade of that place, as we find narrated in 1 Kings ix. 26 seq., and x. 11, and also in 2 Chr. viii. 18, and ix. 10. On the situation of *Ophir* see *Lassen* indische Alterthumskunde i. p. 537 sqq., [Lassen connects the name with the people of the Abhira, who dwelt at the mouth of the Indus] and *C. Ritter* die Erdkunde Thl. 14. p. 351—431 [his thorough investigation also leads to the conclusion that Ophir was in India]. It is well known that others suppose it to have been situated in Jemen or Sofala; *Knobel* [Völkertafel p. 190—193] also looks for it in the southwest of Arabia; the arguments adduced in favour of this site have been subjected by *Ritter* to a careful examination; those in favour of India are of much greater weight").—*Four hundred and fifty talents of gold;* it cannot be determined whether they are to be regarded as the product of one voyage or of the whole trade with Ophir; from chap. ix. 13, however, it is more probable that the whole of the gold imported from Ophir is intended here. See chap. ix. 10 and xi. 21.

Chap. ix. 1—12. *Visit of the Queen of Sabaea;* (cf. 1 Kings x. 1—13; and see the commentary on that passage.—Tr.)

Vv. 13—28. *Solomon's wealth, his forces, and the extension of his kingdom;* answering to 1 Kings x. 14—29, see the commentary on that passage.—Tr.

Vv. 29—31. *Close of Solomon's history;* v. 30 seq. agreeing almost word for word with 1 Kings xi. 42 seq.

## III. Chap. x.—Chap. xxxvi.

### HISTORY OF THE KINGS WHO REIGNED IN JERUSALEM, FROM REHOBOAM TO ZEDEKIAH.

The account of the revolt of the northern tribes, which was

followed by the division of the kingdom of David and Solomon into two separate Israelitish kingdoms (chap. x.—xi. 4), forms an introduction to the history of the monarchical government in the southern kingdom and of the descendants of David who reigned in Jerusalem. But as that account contains at the same time a portion of the history of Rehoboam's reign, and we intend for the sake of clearness to give each reign a chapter to itself, we shall connect it with the general history of Rehoboam.

## 1. Chap. x.—xii.

### RISE OF THE SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN KINGDOMS. HISTORY OF REHOBOAM.

Chap. x. *Revolt of the northern tribes*; cf. 1 Kings xii. 1—19: see the commentary on that passage.

Chap. xi. 1—4. *In obedience to the word of God by the prophet Shemaiah, Rehoboam and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin desist from their intended attack upon the northern tribes*: see the commentary on 1 Kings xii. 21—24.

V. 5—12. *The means adopted by Rehoboam for the defence of his kingdom.* The brief history of Rehoboam in the Book of Kings contains no notice of this.—V. 5. *And he built cities for defence in Judah*: the singular לְמָצוֹר is used, because the cities were to serve for the defence of the southern kingdom; *Judah* is used here as the name of the southern kingdom, because the fortresses mentioned in the following verses were situated in the provinces of Judah and Benjamin.—V. 6—10. We may assume that of the fifteen cities named here, *Aijalon* (in Dan Josh. xix. 42) and *Zorah* (first in Judah Josh. xv. 33, then in Dan Josh. xix. 41), though they formerly belonged to Dan, were at this time reckoned as belonging to the province of Benjamin, which had extended over districts, that were at first assigned to Dan, that tribe having conquered for itself a new inheritance in the most northerly part of the land (Judg. xvii. seq.). *Aijalon*, now Yalo (*Robinson* iii. p. 278), and *Zorah* (probably the present Surah half way between Jerusalem and Jabneh, *Robinson* ii. p.

592) are at least the only cities named here, which from their situation could have belonged to the province of Benjamin, and according to v. 10 the cities, referred to, included fortresses in Benjamin. *Gath;* the city of the Philistines, which had been conquered by David (1 Chr. xviii. 1). It is true that in 1 Kings ii. 39 we read of a king Achish of Gath in the time of Solomon, but it is evident from 2 Chr. ix. 26 and 1 Kings v. 1 that this city was subject to Solomon, even though it had maintained a certain independence under a king of its own. It cannot, therefore, appear strange to us to find the name of this city of the Philistines among the cites fortified by Rehoboam. *Adoraim,* afterwards called Dora, now Dura, a village on the south west of Hebron (Robinson iii. p. 209). עָרֵי מְצוּרוֹת, the second accusative to וַיִּבֶן in v. 6 (cf. chap. viii. 5), *he built Beth-lehem,* &c., *as fortresses.* The fifteen cities were on the south and west of Jerusalem, hence Rehoboam appears to have been more afraid of an attack from the south and west, that is from the Egyptians, than of a war with the northern kingdom.—V. 11. *And he made the fortresses strong;* in this connection the meaning of these words must be that he prepared them for defence in case of an attack, by appointing commanders (cf. v. 23), stocking them with provisions, and (v. 12) supplying them with military stores; for all these defensive measures are summed up again in the expression "*he made them exceeding strong.*" By the supplementary clause "*and he had Judah and Benjamin,*" the statement in chap. x. 17, "he was king over the Israelites who dwelt in the cities of Judah," is more precisely defined.

V. 13—17. *The southern kingdom is strengthened by the fact that the priests and Levites, who are expelled from the northern kingdom, take refuge in it and are followed thither by faithful worshippers of Jehovah from all the tribes.* In the Book of Kings reference is made in 1 Kings xii. 31 and xiii. 33, 34, to the circumstances described here, but the facts narrated in these verses are not recorded there.—V. 14. *For the Levites left their suburbs* (Num. xxxv. 1—8) *and their possessions;* according to v. 8 of the passage cited we are to understand by their possessions the cities of the Levites in the districts of the northern tribes, *for Jeroboam and his sons had thrust them out of the priesthood of Jehovah;* Jeroboam had prohibited his subjects from visiting the temple in Jerusalem (1 Kings xii. 26—28), and had appointed

his own places of worship in Bethel and Dan, where Jehovah was worshipped in the form of an ox, and thus the priests and Levites, who would not break away from the temple at Jerusalem, were compelled by him to leave the kingdom. *And his sons;* by this we are certainly not to understand that the sons of Jeroboam were associated with him in the administration of the government; nor are we even to interpret the words as denoting his lineal descendants, since his second son Nadab was the last of his house who reigned over the northern kingdom; we conclude, therefore, that the persons intended are the successors of Jeroboam in general, and that the passage merely indicates the relation in which all the kings of the northern kingdom stood to the priests of the tribe of Levi and to the rest of the Levites.—V. 15. "*For the high places;*" cf. 1 Kings xii. 31, "a house of high places;" similar places of worship were certainly established in other cities of the northern kingdom (cf. 2 Kings xvii. 9, ix. 29 sqq.). *For the goats*, or for the demons; according to Lev. xvii. 7 this was an odious term applied to idolatry generally (like גללים in 1 Kings xii. 15), which, if not actually introduced by Jeroboam, may have been in existence in his time, and may subsequently have spread further and further. In this verse, as well as the preceding, reference is made to the state of the northern kingdom in Jeroboam's time. *For the calves;* see 1 Kings xii. 28, according to which the words "which he had made" are to be referred to the calves alone.—V. 16. *Such as set their hearts;* cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 19. *They came to Jerusalem*, not only *to offer sacrifices* there, but, as we learn from the next verse, to remain in the southern kingdom. In the same way, at a later period, we find subjects of the northern kingdom connecting themselves with the southern, chap. xv. 9, xxx. 11. *For three years;* there is no reason to question the antiquity of this record, but on the contrary it is *a priori* probable, that the pressure from the north occasioned a proportionally greater earnestness in the religious life of the south, and that the former was weakened and the latter strengthened by the immigrations from the north to the south.

V. 18—23. *Family-records.* In the brief account of the life of Rehoboam we do not meet with these notices, which were probably taken from the sources named in chap. xii. 15.—V. 18. Instead of *ben* many of the MSS., the Septuagint, and the

Vulgate adopt the reading *bath* (daughter) from the Keri; in the Syriac the family-records contained in these verses are not given. *Jerimoth* is not mentioned among the sons of David in 1 Chr. iii. 1—8; if our text be correct he must be regarded as a son of one of David's concubines (1 Chr. iii. 9). Before *Abichail* the Septuagint translators read the *vav copul.*; if we insert this in the text the words may be rendered as follows: *Mahalath the daughter of Jerimoth the son of David, and of Abichail the daughter of Eliab the son of Jesse.* In this case there would be only *one* wife of Rehoboam referred to in the verse before us, namely Mahalath, whose father and mother are both given, and this would fully agree with v. 19 (cf. *v.* 20, "*after her*), where we have further details of only one wife. *Eliab*; the first born of Jesse, 1 Chr. ii. 13.—V. 19. The three sons of Rehoboam here named are only mentioned in this passage. V. 20. *Maacah*; this is the name which we also meet with in 1 Kings xv. 2, but in 2 Chr. xiii. 2 *Michaiah* is said to have been the mother of Abijah; the latter name, however, has crept into the text through a copyist's error. *The daughter of Absalom*; *i.e.*, *of* David's son, for this is the only Absalom we can think of, as there is no further description connected with the name. *Daughter* must be interpreted as meaning *granddaughter*, as we may see from 2 Sam. xiv. 27. Maacah, then, is to be regarded as a daughter of Tamar, as *Josephus* says (Antiq. 8. 10. 1), cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 18. *Abijah*; in 1 Kings he is always called *Abijam*; the former of the two is no doubt correct. The other three children of Maacah are only mentioned here.—V. 21. *He took*; chap. xiii. 21. Instead of *sixty concubines* Josephus mentions only thirty.—V. 22. *He appointed him as chief*, gave him the pre-eminence among his brethren, or, as it is afterwards said by way of explanation, appointed him *as prince among his brethren* (not על אחיו 1 Sam. x. 1, xiii. 14). The short infinitive להמליכו must be interpreted thus: *for* (his intention in doing this was) *to make him king.*—V. 23. *And he* (Rehoboam) *acted sagaciously and dispersed* (פרץ *to scatter*, to locate in different places) *of all his sons* (the different individuals) *into all the provinces of Judah and Benjamin, into all the fortresses, and gave them provisions in abundance, and desired for them a multitude of wives.* Are we to understand that the sagacity of Reho-

boam was displayed in the fact that he entrusted the most important cities of the land, the fortified places, to the care of his sons, and thus put them into the hands of safe commanders? Or did he act wisely in securing for his sons an independent position, an ample revenue and many wives, in other words, a splendid court, and thus making them contented, and saving the brother, for whom the crown was intended, from the fear of rival claims? On comparing chap. xxi. 2, 3, we are necessarily brought to the latter conclusion. *The multitude of wives*, therefore, is mentioned in connexion with the provisions in abundance as an evidence of the splendour of their mode of living and the glory of their respective courts. It is not at all necessary to assume in explanation of this passage, that Rehoboam gave his sons many wives, who were taken from the cities, which he had assigned to them as their places of abode, in order that he might thus establish a closer connexion between his sons and the inhabitants of the cities.

Chap. xii. 1—12. *The Egyptian king Shishak conquers Jerusalem;* (compare the brief account in 1 Kings xiv. 25—28.)—V. 1. The infinitive כהכין, "*at the time of the strengthening,*" must be regarded as an indefinite active, and resolved as follows: when they had strengthened, or, as we should express it, "*when the kingdom of Rehoboam had become strong;*" the reference is to chap xi. 17.—"*And when he had become strong;*" see chap. xxvi. 16.—*All Israel;* all the inhabitants of the southern kingdom (cf. v. 6). The meaning is, that for the first three years of his reign Rehoboam and his people adhered faithfully to God; in the fourth year the apostasy occurred; in the fifth the punishment of the apostasy was inflicted (v. 2.)—V. 2 we find in precisely the same terms in 1 Kings xiv. 25, with the exception of the explanatory clause at the end. On *Shishak*, the first king of the twenty-second (Bubast.) dynasty of Manetho, compare *Thenius* on 1 Kings xi. 40. On a piece of sculpture in the great palace at Carnac *Champollion* found Shishak represented as the conqueror of a large number of princes, among whom, if the inscription was read correctly, the name Rehoboam was found. —V. 3. Among the numberless troops, brought by Shishak from Egypt, there were *Libyans* (chap. xvi. 8, Daniel xi. 43; in Gen

x. 13 they are called *Lehabim*, probably the inhabitants of Mareotis and Libya, to the west of the Canopian mouth of the Nile, *Knobel* Völkertafel p. 283), *Sukkiim* (only mentioned in this passage, according to the Septuagint and Vulgate, they were Troglodites, probably the Ethiopian Troglodytes on the mountains along the western coast of the Arabian gulf, cf. *Winer* Reallexicon *s.v.* Suchim), *and Ethiopians* (from the districts to the south of Egypt).—V. 4. *The fortresses ;* viz. those which had been put in a state of defence for the purpose of resisting an invasion on the part of the Egyptians.—V. 5. Whilst Shishak with his army stood before Jerusalem, Shemaiah spoke to Rehoboam and the princes, who had been driven back by the Egyptian army and had retired to Jerusalem for the purpose of defending the capital. *Ye have forsaken ;* see 1 Chr. xiii. 11. By the concluding words, "*therefore have I left you*" &c., the prophet sets before them utter defeat and complete destruction, as we may infer from *v.* 7 and *v.* 12 ("*I will not destroy them*"); see also the similar words in chap. xv. 2, xxiv. 20, and Deut. xxxi. 16 seq. *Into the power of Shishak;* Neh. ix. 28.—V. 6. *Then they bowed themselves;* chap. vii. 14, xiii. 18, xxxii. 26. *The princes of Israel;* in v. 5 we find "the princes of Judah." *Jehovah is just;* Ezra ix. 15; Neh. ix. 33.—V. 7. כמעט *in a little, i.e,* in a short time; compare the similar words in Ezra ix. 8. *And my wrath shall not be poured out upon Jerusalem by Shishak;* see on the other hand chap. xxxiv. 25.—V. 8. *For they shall be servants to him* for a short time, *that they may discern my service and the service of the kingdoms of the lands, i.e.,* that they may see that my rule is not so oppressive as that of foreign kings. "*Of the kingdoms of the countries;*" cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 30.—V. 9. The account of Shishak's invasion is renewed after this parenthesis, and the words of v. 2 are repeated. It was not necessary to say expressly that the invasion did not end with a mere advance against Jerusalem, as the temple and palace could not possibly be plundered till the city was conquered.—*The golden shields;* cf. chap. ix. 16. There is a clause appended to the Septuagint version of 1 Kings xiv. 26 to the effect that Shishak also carried away the golden armour, which David had taken as spoil in the war with the king of Zobah, cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 7.—V. 11. *The runners*, who kept guard

in the porch of the king's palace (2 Kings xi. 19) attended the king when he went to the temple, and then carried away the valuable shields. It is probable that these shields were used on other occasions in connection with solemn processions, in which the king took part. They were kept *in the guard-room of the runners;* the golden shields which Solomon had made were kept in the forest-house of Lebanon (chap. ix. 16).—V. 12. Account of the fulfilment of the promise contained in v. 7 seq. "*And* (it was) *not entirely to destroy* (the infinitive after the negative as in 1 Chr. v. 1) *the good things, which still remained in Judah;* these were piety and faithful adherence to Jehovah, for the sake of which Judah was not altogether destroyed, cf. chap. xix. 3.

Vv. 13, 14. *Length of Rehoboam's reign. His mother. Estimate of his character* (cf. 1 Kings xiv. 21, 22). V. 12. On the first clause see chap. i. 1, xiii. 21. As Rehoboam's reign has been described already, we must explain the verse as follows: *King Rehoboam* (after the withdrawal of the Egyptians) strengthened *his government* (he was not strong enough to resist Jeroboam, chap. xiii. 7) *and was king, for he was forty-one years old when he began to reign, and he reigned seventeen years;* the word *for* is used here, because it is evident from the chronological data, that he reigned for a series of years after the conquest of Jerusalem by Shishak, which took place in the fifth year of his reign. וְשְׁבַע, in 1 Kings וּשֲׁבַע, in many MSS. the word is pointed thus in this passage also. The composite Sheva is sometimes introduced in this manner after וּ, to make it still more evident that the Sheva does not close the syllable. *Which Jehovah had chosen;* cf. chap. vi. 5, 6, and 20. *Naamah the Ammonitess,* see chap. x. 1.—V. 14. In the Book of Kings the judgment here pronounced is extended to the conduct of Judah, that is, of the inhabitants of the southern kingdom; here it is restricted to that of the king. On the conduct of the people the historian had already had occasion to speak at chap. xi. 17, xii. 12, he had also given such an account of Rehoboam in the chapter under revision, vv. 6 and 12, that the general announcement "*he did evil*" would appear somewhat strange if it were not modified and rendered more definite by the further clause "*for he did not direct his heart firmly to seek Jehovah*" (chap. xix. 3, xxx. 19; Ezra vii. 10).

Vv. 15, 16. *Conclusion;* cf. 1 Kings xiv. 29, 30.—V. 15. *And the wars of Rehoboam and Jeroboam were every day, i.e.,* they continued during the whole of Rehoboam's reign; cf. chap. xi. 4.—V. 16. *Abijah,* see chap. xi. 22.

## 2. Chap. xiii.

### ABIJAH.

Vv. 1 and 2 a. (cf. 1 Kings xv. 1, 2) *Michaiah daughter of Uriel of Gibeah;* in chap. xi. 20—22 and 1 Kings xv. 2, 10, 13, his mother is called Maacah the daughter of Absalom. *Caspari* (on Micha the Morasthite) concludes that she had two names; that the one, Maacah, was given her by her mother at her birth, and that she received the other as a mark of her husband's favour when she became queen-mother. But nothing of this kind is said at chap. xi. 20 seq., where there was a fitting opportunity for speaking of any such change of name, and although, as *Caspari* says, we find the name Michaiah in the passage before us in which she is first mentioned as queen-mother, yet in the parallel passage of the Book of Kings the name Maacah occurs just as on every other occasion. In the *Septuagint* and *Syriac* the name Maacah is given here also, and if the *Vulgate* has Michaia all that can be inferred from this is, that at a comparatively early time the name Michaia had been substituted for *Maacah* through an error of the pen. It is further to be observed that the mother of Abijah is always described as a daughter of Absalom, and that this is the only passage in which she is said to have been a daughter of Uriel of Gibeah. The two accounts might be reconciled by assuming that the daughter of Absalom was married to Uriel, and that Maacah the mother of Abijah was their daughter, and might therefore be called a daughter of Absalom, whose grand-daughter she actually was. When, however, we consider that the wife of Abijah and mother of Asa was also named Maacah (1 Kings xv. 13; 2 Ch. xv. 16), and further that in 1 Kings xv. 10 this Maacah is also said to have been the daughter of Absalom, whilst there are no such statements in the Chronicles, there is no improbability in the conjecture that

Maacah, the mother of Abijah, the daughter of Absalom, has been confused with Maacah the mother of Asa, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah, and that in the passage before us the mother of Asa has been substituted by mistake for the mother of Abijah.[1] It is possible that the Uriel mentioned here may have been the Levite spoken of in the history of David (1 Chr. xv. 5, 11), but this is improbable on chronological grounds. Whether the Gibeah here named was the well-known city in the tribe of Benjamin (Gibeath Benjamin or Gibeath Saul) or Gibeah in the province of Judah (Josh. xv. 57, most likely the village of Jeba on a conical hill to the southwest of Bethlehem, *Robinson* ii. 580, 593) cannot be determined.

V. 2 b.—20. *War between Abijah and Jeroboam.* The Book of Kings contains no account of this war, which is merely referred to in the few words "*there was strife between Abijah and Jeroboam*" (1 Kings xv. 6, 7).—V. 3. *And Abijah opened the war*, 1 Kings xx. 14.—*With an army, heroes of war, four hundred thousand young men;* בחיל occurs in just this connection in chap. xiv. 8, the number being placed afterwards in apposition. גבור חיל, chap. xvii. 16 seq. in the same sense as גבורי מלחמה.—V. 4. Abijah encamped *on* Mount Zemaraim; when he stood up to speak he rose up *from upon* (מֵעַל) the hill. The prep. *al* is associated with the *lamed* of indirect subordination, though in a somewhat less dependent position. Mount *Zemaraim* is only met with here; the city of that name, which is mentioned in Josh xviii. 22 as situated near Bethel, and was therefore probably a little to the south of this city on the northern frontier of the kingdom of Abijah, was most likely a fortified city built upon the mountain referred to here. The opinion that Zemaraim was connected with *Cherbet el Somra* in the valley of the Jordan (*v. Raumer* p. 204) is scarcely favoured by this passage. As Abijah now spoke from Mount Zemaraim, so did Jotham the

[1] It is difficult to see why the word "mother" may not stand for grandmother in 1 Ki. xv. 10 as well as the word "daughter" for grand-daughter in this passage, which Bertheau admits may be a sufficient explanation. The same Maacah would then be intended throughout, who would be daughter of Uriel, daughter (= grand-daughter) of Absalom, mother of Abijah, and mother (= grand-mother) of Asa. So *Keil.—Tr.*

son of Gideon formerly speak from Mount Gerizim to the inhabitants of Sichem, Judg. ix. 7.—V. 5. *Is it not to you to know*, *i.e.* must it not be known to you? The infinitive with *lamed* in this connexion is one of the peculiarities of our historian (cf. 1 Chr. xiii. 4). *A covenant of salt;* these words are added (in the accusative) to give greater precision to the entire sentence: *as a salt covenant*, or *after the manner of a salt covenant* (Num. xviii. 9). In Lev. ii. 13, we find a reference to the salt of the covenant, which had to be sprinkled upon all the meat-offerings (offerings of corn; according to Ezek. xliii. 24 it was sprinkled upon the animal sacrifices also), so that every offering was made, as it were, a covenant-offering by means of the salt. This was certainly in accordance with an ancient custom, according to which the salt durst not be omitted from the covenant-feasts, the salt itself being regarded as a symbol of the perpetuity and indestructibility of the covenant; hence the salt-covenant was a firm covenant, which had been concluded in a peculiarly solemn manner.—V. 6. *The servant of Solomon*; 1 Kings xi. 11.—V. 7. The first clause calls to mind 1 Kings xi. 24. "*Children of Belial;*" this expression does not occur anywhere else in the Chronicles; see 1 Kings xxi. 10—13.—Rehoboam was forty-one years old when he began to reign (chap. xii. 13) and therefore when we find him referred to here as a boy (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 1) and of tender heart, *i.e.*, modest and retiring, this must evidently be intended to make the conduct of Jeroboam appear the more hateful when contrasted with the circumstances of the youthful king. It must also be borne in mind, that in 2 Chr. x. 8 Rehoboam is described as manifesting all the rashness of youth. *And did not show himself firm;* cf. chap. xii. 13.—V. 8. *And now ye speak* (think) *to show yourselves strong before the kingdom of Jehovah through the hand of the sons of David* (ye expect to contend successfully against the kingdom, which Jehovah himself is governing through the descendants of David; and indeed) *ye are a great multitude, and with you are the golden calves* (chap. xi. 15), but that can do you no good, for Jehovah is on our side, not on yours (v. 10), for ye have offended Him as ye yourselves must admit.—V. 9. *Have ye not banished the priests of Jehovah*, &c. (chap. xi. 14), *and made you priests like the nations of the lands*, whose priests are not sons of Levi (1 Kings

xii. 31, and particularly xiii. 33), making a priest, for example, of *every one who came for consecration* (לְמַלֵּא יָדוֹ that they might fill his hand, Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9, *i.e.* that he might receive authority to perform the duties of the priest's office, cf. Judg. xvii. 5) with a *young bullock and seven rams?* According to Ex. xxix., when a priest was consecrated, a young bullock was sacrificed as an expiatory offering, a ram as a burnt-offering, and another as a ram of consecration. This had to be done for seven days, and hence seven rams were required. It is evident, therefore, that the sacrifices prescribed by the law are referred to in this passage, though they are not fully described. But these sacrifices alone were not sufficient to constitute any one a priest of Jehovah, and hence Jeroboam's priests were merely priests of an imaginary deity (lit. a *non-Elohim*), *i.e.*, as Jehovah was really Elohim, priests who could make no pretension to be priests of Jehovah. —V. 10. *And the Levites are in the service; i.e.*, they perform the service in accordance with the law, for it can be duly performed by members of the tribe of Levi alone.—V. 11. Thus we are in possession of the worship prescribed by the law. The words from קְטֹרֶת-סַמִּים onwards are very loosely connected: *and the sweet smelling incense and the showbread, &c.* (exist among us). Only *one* gilded table is mentioned here; cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 16, 2 Chr. iv. 19.—*The charge of Jehovah;* Lev. viii. 35.—V. 12. *And behold, with us there are at the head* (as champions and leaders, not the two calves (v. 8) but) *the God* (Jehovah) *and his priests,* (and beside this we have also) *the sounding trumpets, that they may sound against you,* (but their sounding is the sure pledge of victory on our side, Num. x. 9 and xxxi. 6, therefore) *ye Israelites,* (as distinguished from the men of Judah, v. 14 sqq.) *fight not against Jehovah, for ye will not succeed,* cf. chap. xxiv. 20.—Vv. 13—17. Abijah fought under the most unfavourable circumstances, being attacked both before and behind, but yet he obtained the most complete victory, for his warriors cried to Jehovah, and the priests blew their trumpets.—V. 13. *Jeroboam caused the troops appointed for an ambush to come round to their rear; and the rest of their troops* (evidently led by Jeroboam himself) *formed in front of Judah, and those who formed the ambush in their rear.*—V. 14. As soon as he was attacked, *Judah prepared* to meet the enemy, and then first was it discovered that the

attack had been made on two sides.—V. 15. ויריעו; in the connection in which this word occurs here it can hardly denote the shout of the warriors. The reference to v. 12 is very conspicuous, and we must therefore render the passage: *the men of Judah had* (the war trumpets) *sounded*, which were blown by the priests at their head, and in consequence of this "*Jehovah himself smote Israel*" (cf. chap. xiv. 11; Judg. xx. 35).—V. 17. *And Abijah and his people slew among them a great slaughter;* Num. xi. 33; Josh. x. 20.—Vv. 18—20. Consequences of Abijah's victory.—V. 18. ויכנעו is an antithesis to "*the sons of Judah became strong*," and therefore means "*they were humbled, became weak*" (differently expressed in chap. xii. 6).—V. 19. The city of Jeshanah (*Septuagint* Ἰεσυνά) only occurs in this passage, it is probably the same as Ἰσάνας, *Josephus* Antiq. 14. 15. 12; we are unable to discover the exact site on which it stood. *Ephron* (Kethib, Septuagint and Vulgate) we should necessarily connect with Mount Ephron on the south-western border of the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xv. 9): but the Keri has *Ephrain*, and this spelling rather points to Ἐφραίμ (Josh. xi. 54), a city which was situated, according to Josephus (B. j. 4. 9. 9), in the neighbourhood of Bethel. The three cities named here with their surrounding districts did not continue long in the possession of the king of the southern kingdom. They are apparently noticed again in chap. xv. 8 as the cities which Asa had taken from Mount Ephraim; but Baasha, the king of the northern kingdom, had reconquered the territory in which these three cities stood, as we may infer from the fact that he made an attempt to fortify Ramah, which was only about five miles distant from Jerusalem (1 Kings xv. 17).—V. 20. "*Recover strength;*" see 1 Chr. xxix. 14. *And Jehovah smote him* (Jeroboam) *and he died;* do these words refer to a sudden death, or some peculiarly painful disease (cf. chap. xxi. 18); or does the word ויגפהו recal the great event recorded in v. 15, "*and God smote Jeroboam?*" The latter is the more natural conclusion. Jeroboam did not die for two years after the death of Abijah.

V. 21. chap. xiv. 1. *Abijah's wives and children. His death.*—V. 21. cf. chap. xii. 13. It was not in consequence of his becoming strong on his throne that he took the wives, for he only reigned three years, and must therefore most likely have

had the greater number of his wives before he became king; by the *vav. conseq.* in וַיִּשָּׂא the account of the wives and children is only connected quite loosely with the previous words.—Chap. xiv. 1 (cf. chap. xii. 16). *During Asa's reign the land had rest ten years,* a remark which is no doubt made here because this rest was the result of the great victory of Abijah over Jeroboam; the period of rest was spent by Asa (according to chap. xiv. 5) in building fortresses in Judah (cf. chap. xv. 19).

## 3. Chap. xiv.—Chap. xvi.

### ASA.

Chap. xiv. 2—5 (1—4). *Asa, a pious king, removes the foreign altars and endeavours to root out idolatry.* In the history of Asa in the first Book of Kings (chap. xv.) the 11th and 12th verses correspond to these four verses, except that very different expressions are employed to describe the idols, which Asa removed.—V. 1 (2). Compare the sentence on King Hezekiah, chap. xxxi. 20. —Vv. 2 (3). *He removed . . . the high places;* in chap. xv. 17, and 1 Kings xv. 14, on the other hand, it is said that *the high places were not taken away.* In the same way do we find it said of Jehoshaphat (2 Chr. xvii. 6) that he removed high places, whereas in chap. xx. 33, a complaint is uttered that in his days the high places were not taken away. These apparently contradictory statements must refer to two different kinds of high places, as we may gather from the context. The high places which had been set apart for idolatrous worship they removed, but those which were consecrated to the worship of Jehovah, *e.g.* the Bamah in Bethel, where Jehovah was worshipped under the image of an ox, were still left standing. *Asherim;* compare *Thenius* on 1 Kings xiv. 23, who has shown, as I think correctly, that Ashera primarily denoted any image set up for the purpose of idolatrous worship, and was afterwards applied more particularly to the image of Astarte. V. 3 (4). cf. chap. xv. 12. V. 4 (5). חַמָּנִים; the images or the pillars, which are described in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 4, as standing upon the altar of Baal. *And the kingdom was quiet before him;* this does not mean that there

were no wars at all during his reign, but that the southern kingdom had peace when he was king, though it may have been but for a short time (cf. chap. xiii. 23).

Vv. 5—7 (6—8). *Military defences;* in 1 Kings xv. 23 there is also a reference to fortresses, which were built by Asa. —V. 5. (6). *He built fortresses;* chap. xi. 5 sqq. *During these years;* the ten years of rest mentioned in chap. xiii, 23. It is evident from the connection and the course of the narrative that the first ten years of his reign are intended.—V. 6 (7). *Those cities there;* what cities we are not told, but the historian was evidently thinking of other cities besides Gebah and Mispah, which are described in chap. xvi. 6 as having been fortified by Asa. *We will build a wall round about;* the verb נסב conveys the general notion of building and making ready with reference to the following objects, *towers, doors, and bolts. The land is still before us;* we can move freely in it, and build fortresses at pleasure, whereas at a future time, if the foe should invade the country and keep possession, we should be prevented from doing this.—*So they built and succeeded;* correctly rendered by the *Vulgate, nullumque in exstruendo impedimentum fuit.*—V. 7. The sons of Judah also came to David with *shield and lance,* that is as heavy armed (1 Chr. xii. 24), whilst Benjamin furnished archers, cf. 1 Chr. viii. 40. Judah and Benjamin contributed 580,000 men; according to chap. xiii. 3 Abijah led 400,000 men into the field.

Vv. 8—14 (9—15). *The Cushite Zerach invades Judah with a large army and is defeated.*—V. 8 (9). We are certainly warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Cushite *Zerach* was the same person as Osorkhon, who followed Shishak (Sesonchis) in the line of Egyptian kings, and was the second king of the twenty-second dynasty. On the royal arms of Egypt he is called *Osorkhon,* a name which reminds us at once of Zerach. On the reason for his being called the Cushite, and not the king of Egypt, see *Thenius* on 1 Kings xv. 23. *Mareshah;* one of the cities which Rehoboam fortified (chap. xi. 8).—V. 10. The battle was fought in the valley of Zephathah which extends to Mareshah. The valley of Zephathah must not be confounded with Zephath mentioned in Judg. i. 17, since the account contained in these verses clearly shows that it was situ-

ated somewhere in the neighbourhood of Mareshah, and according to Robinson, ii. 693, the latter city was about a Roman mile and a-half to the south of Eleutheropolis. Mareshah was in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv. 44). We must not imagine that this extensive south-western plain was called *the valley of Zephathah*, for in other places it is called הַשְּׁפֵלָה; on the contrary we may conclude that the scene of the battle was a valley, which opens into this plain, probably the fine open valley of which Robinson speaks (ii. 613).—V. 10 (11). *There is none beside thee to help between the mighty and the powerless; i.e.* no other than thou can help in an unequal conflict, meaning of course give help to the weaker side. בין before the first word, ל (for which in other instances we find וּבֵין *e.g.* Gen. i. 13) before the second, as in Gen. i. 6 *between water and between water*. The *Vulgate* renders the passage thus: *Domine, non est apud te ulla distantia utrum in paucis auxilieris an in pluribus;* in this the translators were guided by 1 Sam. xiv. 6. The earlier expositors *(e.g. Rambach)* adopt this rendering, and supply מעצור before עצר from the passage referred to; cf. 1 Macc. iii. 18. *In thy name we have fallen upon this multitude;* a similar passage occurs in chap. xx. 12 cf. 1 Kings xx. 13, 28.—V. 11 (12). *So Jehovah smote*, &c.; cf. chap. xiii. 15.—V. 12 (13). *As far as to Gerar; Rowland* found in the Wady Gerar, about eight miles to the south-east of Gaza, Kirbet-el-Gerar, which stands no doubt on the site of the ancient Gerar. לאין להם מחיה, *till they had nothing alive;* cf. Ezra ix. 8, 9, 14. For לאין we find the clearer expression עד-לאין 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16. *Before his camp;* the army of Asa is called a camp of Jehovah, because God himself conducted it to victory. Earlier expositors fancied that the reference was to a heavenly camp, a host of angels, according to Gen. xxxii. 2 seq.—V. 13 (14). The cities round about Gerar were probably at that time in the possession of the Philistines, who had very likely joined with the Cushite Zerach in attacking Asa. *For the dread of Jehovah had fallen upon them;* viz. upon the inhabitants of the cities (chap. xvii. 10, 20, 29). בזה רבה *much spoil* (chap. xxv. 13); the word *bizzah* occurs once in Ezekiel (xxix. 19), otherwise we only meet with it in the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and Esther.—V. 14 (15). *And they also smote the tents of the cattle;* probably they

conquered the nomad tribes in the neighbourhood of Gerar and in the desert to the south of Gerar, and took their camels and sheep as prey.

Chap. xv. 1—15. *Asa follows the injunctions of the prophet Azariah ben Oded to root out idolatry, and serve Jehovah alone. In a solemn assembly in the third month of the fifteenth year of Asa's reign all Judah and Benjamin, and strangers from other Israelitish tribes, pledged themselves to adhere faithfully to Jehovah.*—V. 1. On *Azariah ben Oded* see v. 8.—V. 2. The prophet *went to meet* Asa, as he was returning from the war; ויצא לפני occurs with the same signification in chap. xxviii. 9; (cf. 1 Chr. xiv. 8). On the last clause of the verse see chap. xxiv. 20.—Vv. 3—5. Earlier commentators disputed whether these verses referred to past times, or to the condition of the northern kingdom when the words were spoken, or to a future period (namely, during the exile of the Israelites), and whether the term Israel was applied to the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, to those of the southern kingdom, or to the Israelites universally? Again, if the reference is to past times, the question arises what particular period had the prophet in view? (Compare on this subject *Camp. Vitringa* de Synag. vetere p. 335—347). From v. 4 it is evident that the prophet is speaking of something, which had been confirmed by the history of Israel; and in v. 5 seq. it becomes still more apparent, that he refers to times gone by. The fact that God only suffers himself to be found by a faithful nation had been learned by experience, not by the southern kingdom or the northern kingdom alone, but by the whole of Israel, and especially in the time of the judges. Particular expressions in vv. 4, 5, and 6 remind us directly of the descriptions of the state of Israel during the period of the Judges, and from these we may infer that that is the period referred to here. At the same time there is no doubt that the passage before us contains a general description of the relation of God to Israel, the truth of which is established not merely by the history of the Judges, but by the whole of the history of Israel, so far as our historian could trace it; for it is evident, from the address itself, that the historian reports the address of the ancient prophet in his own way and with his own words. *And for many days the nation of Israel had no true God, and no*

*teaching priest and no law;* לְלֹא is the expression used in the text, not לְאֵין (if the latter had been the term employed the meaning would be: *so that there was no true God,* &c., 1 Chr. xxii. 4, 2 Chr. xx. 25); even without the repeated ל before לא the words would be intelligible, and must be rendered in the manner already indicated; the *lamed* is, therefore, inserted according to later usage merely to give prominence to the different nouns which are connected immediately with לא, cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 6. The assumption that לְלֹא means *without* in this passage is quite arbitrary. *Many days;* this is an accusative of time, Jer. xxxii. 14.—אלהי אמת, cf. אלהי אמן, Is. lxv. 16, and אלהים אמת Jer. x. 10, where אמת is in apposition to *Elohim.* It is in vain to seek for any confirmation of the opinion that the "*teaching priest*" means the high priest, and *Vitringa's* method of explaining the words by asserting that there was no high priest between Phinehas and Eli is altogether inadmissible, for we have an unbroken series of high priests named in 1 Chr. v. 30 seq., and it is *a priori* improbable that our historian should intend to say that *for a long time* there was no high priest, in direct opposition to the view which so decidedly prevailed in late times, that the succession of high priests had been unbroken. The simple design of the passage is to picture in grand outlines the general condition of the people during the period of the apostasy, when the mass of the Israelites had turned to idols, paying no attention to the instructions of the true Jehovah-priests and acting without regard to the law. The words of the prophet, therefore, must be interpreted according to the other descriptions of a similar kind, relating to the general condition of the people, *e.g.* in such passages as Judges ii. 11, iii. 7, cf. Deut. iv. 27—31.—V. 4. See Deut. iv. 29, seq. Judges ii. 15.—V. 5. *And in those very times;* the times of the apostasy described in v. 3. *For him who went out and for him who came in;* all free communication was interrupted, cf. Judges v. 6 and vi. 2. *Great vexations,* Amos iii. 9; in Deut. xxviii. 20 Jehovah is said to have sent *Mehomah* as a punishment of apostasy. The plural הארצות *(the countries),* so frequently employed by this historian, can only refer in the present connexion to the countries of Israel, *i.e.* to the different provinces

of the country inhabited by the Israelites, cf. chap. xxxiv. 33.—V. 6. *And there were beaten in pieces;* the Pual of כתת only occurs in this passage; in some MSS. the word is pointed וְכִתְּתוּ, but in by far the greatest number and the best we find the Pual. It is quite in harmony with the rhetorical nature of the passage that the contentions of the Israelites among themselves (*e.g.* in the time of the Judges between the inhabitants of Gilead and Ephraim, and between Benjamin and the rest of the tribes, Judges xii., 4 seq. xx.—xxi., and in later times between the two Israelitish kingdoms) should be described as a crushing of one people by the other (גוי־בגוי). *For God had confounded them with all kinds of oppressions,* the result of which had been the dissolution of the state and civil war, cf. Is. ix. 18—20. *But you, be strong,* &c., do not cease to adhere faithfully to Jehovah, for as ye have conquered Zerach and his army through the help of Jehovah, so will Jehovah help you still; on the last clause see Jer. xxxi. 16. V. 8. *These words and the prophecy:* the words of the prophet *were* the prophecy, hence the meaning must be: *these words and* (to use a more expressive term) *the prophecy. Oded the prophet;* the prophecy was not delivered by Oded, but according to v. 1 by Azariah ben Oded. The difficulty presented by this passage cannot be solved by assuming that, through an error on the part of a copyist, the original words Oded ben Azariah were transposed in v. 1, so as to read Azariah ben Oded (Movers p. 261), or by the supposition that Oded, the actual composer of the address, commissioned his son Azariah to deliver it (*Knobel* Prophetismus ii. p. 68), for the word הנבואה, in the absolute state with the article, would still have to be explained, and we are not at liberty to say, without further reasons, that it is used here in the sense of the construct נְבוּאַת (*e.g.* chap. ix. 29). The *Vulgate* and *Septuagint* (Cod. Alex.) read Oded in verse 1 instead of Azariah ben Oded, but this can only be regarded as an unsuccessful attempt to improve a corrupt text. The sole remedy is to erase the words "*of Oded the prophet,*" which are probably the remains of a marginal note, referring the prophecy to Azariah ben Oded mentioned in v. 1, which crept from the margin into the text. In the Arabic version the words "*of Oded the prophet*" are omitted, but we cannot lay much stress upon this. *He took courage;* Asa for his part

complied with the injunction in v. 7 "*be ye strong;*" the Hithpael is written here as in chap. xiii. 7, with *patach* in the last syllable. By "*the cities which he had taken from Mount Ephraim,*" we are no doubt to understand those which had been taken by Asa's father Abijah, chap. xiii. 19. *He renewed* (chap. xxiv. 4) *the altar of Jehovah, which was before the porch of Jehovah* (chap. viii. 12), *i.e.* the altar of burnt-offering; as it is evident from the context that the renewal can only denote a *restoration of the altar to the worship of Jehovah,* we must assume that under the predecessors of Asa it had been defiled by idolatrous priests. אוּלָם with Kamez in the last syllable, which is retained in this word in the construct state; cf. 1 Kings vii. 7, 12; Ezek. xl. 7.—V. 9. As *strangers, i.e.* Israelites belonging to other tribes, had flocked at an earlier period into the southern kingdom (chap. xi. 16), so did they now come in the time of Asa, when they saw that he was a pious king, and was desirous of restoring the worship of Jehovah, cf. chap. xxx. 11, 18. It is striking that among the strangers mentioned there are members of the tribe of Simeon, for the inheritance of Simeon was in the province of Judah, and in the historical books it is always taken for granted that the tribe of Simeon belonged to the southern kingdom. It is evidently out of the question to infer from this passage and the similar words in chap. xxxiv. 6, that Simeon was one of the ten tribes of the northern kingdom. The account given here might be explained on the assumption that some of the Simeonites, who were living at that time outside their own province, possibly within the limits of the northern kingdom, came up to Jerusalem to take part in the festival instituted by Asa. *They fell to him;* see 1 Chr. xii. 19 seq.—V. 11. *On that day; i.e.* the day on which the festival was celebrated in the third month of the fifteenth year of the reign of Asa. The clause, "*they offered of the spoil,*" which is attached without the copula, contains a more exact definition of the foregoing sentence; the perfect must therefore be rendered by the present participle "*offering of the booty.*" There were no *oxen* mentioned among the animals taken as plunder, chap. xiv. 14.—V. 12. *And they entered into the covenant,* they bound themselves in a solemn manner, *to seek,* &c.; on בא בברית, followed by the infinitive with *lamed,* see Jer. xxxiv. 10, and Nehem. x. 30.—V. 13. The obligation did not stop

there, they also engaged that *every one, who would not seek Jehovah the God of Israel, should be put to death*; see the more precise injunctions in the law in Deut. xvii 2—6.—V. 14. The loud music, with which the conclusion of the covenant was accompanied, is noticed very briefly here; compare the more precise descriptions in chap. xxiii. 13; Nehem. xii. 27—43.—V. 15. *All Judah*, the whole of the southern kingdom; they *rejoiced at the oath*, on account of its results, for *with all their heart they had sworn, &c., and he suffered himself to be found of them* (v. 2), and God gave them rest *round about*.

Vv. 16—18. *Further particulars respecting Asa's conduct in religious matters*; compare 1 Kings xv. 13—15, which agrees almost word for word with this passage. (See also the commentary on Kings.—Tr.)—V. 17. *Out of Israel*; the context shows that the northern kingdom is not intended here. After "*perfect*" we find "*with Jehovah*" in 1 Kings; the high places he did not remove, only he himself was attached to God, devoted to him, *i.e.* he did not worship Jehovah upon the high places, but in the temple at Jerusalem. This is not at variance with either the account contained in chap. xvi. 7—10 of his conduct towards the prophet Hanani and some of the people, or his behaviour during his last illness, chap. xvi. 12.—V. 18. We are not told where the offerings (1 Chr. xxvi. 26), which Asa's father Abijah ought to have brought to the temple of Jehovah as part of the booty after his splendid victory over Jeroboam (chap. xiii. 16—19), had been kept till now, when Asa brought them into the temple. It has been assumed by earlier expositors that Abijah had placed them among the things that had been dedicated to idols; but it is just as reasonable to suppose, that he applied them to the improvement of the royal treasury. The offerings of Asa himself were part of the plunder obtained on the occasion of his victory over Zerach (chap. xiv. 12). *Thenius* very justly points out how the statements in 1 Kings xv. 15 "serve to confirm the accounts given in the Chronicles of the victories of Abijah and Asa," whilst the latter again furnishes an explanation of the former.

V. 19—Chap. xvi. 6. *Baasha the King of the northern kingdom invades Judah.* cf. 1 Kings xv. 16—22. Verse 19 is closely connected with chap. xvi. 1, and must therefore be interpreted

thus: *and there was no war* (with Baasha) *till the thirty-fifth year of Asa's reign;* (and according to chap. xvi. 1) *but in the thirty-sixth year, &c.* But this does not remove the difficulty which is caused by the chronological statement here made, for, according to 1 Kings xv. 33, Baasha ascended the throne in the third year of Asa's reign, and died after reigning twenty-four years, that is, in the twenty-seventh year of the reign of Asa. Earlier commentators thought that the two accounts could be harmonised by assuming that the thirty-five years were reckoned from the rise of the southern kingdom (*annum* 35 *regni Asae, h. e. regni Judae cui Asa præerat*, Rambach and the earlier theologians); the thirty-fifth year of the kingdom of Judah is the fifteenth year of Asa's reign, and the war with Baasha would thus have broken out in Asa's sixteenth year. But it is evident that we cannot rest contented with this assumption, for "*the reign of Asa*" is expressly mentioned in this and the following verse, and the assertion that there was no war in the first thirty-five years of the existence of the southern kingdom, would stand in open contradiction to the account of the war between Abijah and Jeroboam, in chap. xiii. The chronology must therefore be at fault here. *Thenius* assumes, that "in 2 Chr. xiii. 23 the ten should be altered into six, and in this passage the thirty-five into five (the thirty may have arisen by mistake from the introduction of ל = 30 caused by the eye wandering to the word למלכות which follows immediately afterwards); and in the same way the thirty-six must be altered into six in chap. xvi. 1, so that the sense of the passage would be: till the sixth year Asa had rest, and in the sixth year the war broke out between him and Baasha. In this case the invasion of Zerach must have taken place at a subsequent period. The whole would thus be arranged in perfect order." But not without many alterations, and the same result can be attained by a shorter road. If we assume that the original reading of the verse before us was "the 15th year of the reign of Asa," this number may easily have been changed by mistake into 35; and the number thirty-five may even more readily have found its way into the text, if some reader, from a desire to give still greater precision to the chronological datum, wrote in the margin that the 15th year of Asa's reign was the 35th year from the rise of the southern kingdom, and

the thirty-five crept from the margin into the text. If we read fifteen for thirty-five, and sixteen for thirty-six in the next verse, no further change would be required: there was rest for the first ten years of Asa's reign (chap. xiii. 23); during this period the preparations for war were made (chap. xiv. 5); between the tenth and the fifteenth year the invasion of Zerach took place; up to the fifteenth there was no war with Baasha; in the sixteenth the war broke out. There are other ways in which we might try to solve the difficulty, but it can never be solved without altering the present text. It cannot be urged as an objection to the method proposed by us, that the assertion, "*there was no war till the fifteenth year of Asa's reign,*" is too startling, when the invasion of Zerach had been mentioned just before; for the context shows that this statement is merely intended to refer to the relation in which Asa stood to Baasha; moreover it may be conjectured without hesitation, that it was taken from a source, which was chiefly occupied with the wars between the kings of the two Israelitish kingdoms. The account given in 1 Kings xv. 16 that there was war between Asa and Baasha throughout their entire reign does not harmonise with the verse before us.—(We quote Keil's explanation here, which differs somewhat from that of Bertheau. He says: the words of the Chronicles are not in irreconcileable contradiction to those of Kings. For when it is said in 1 Kings xv. 32, "there was war between Asa and Baasha all their days," this may be explained as referring not to open war, but to the hostile relation in which the two kingdoms stood to each other, for there is no account in the Book of Kings of any other war between them than the one described in the Chronicles in which Baasha occupied Ramah, a city about thirty miles from Jerusalem that commanded the road to Judah [1 Kings xv. 17 sqq.]. There remains therefore merely the announcement, that this war broke out in the 36th year of Asa's reign, and that there was peace till the 35th, which is at variance with the Book of Kings. If this discrepancy were irreconcileable, we might assume that there was an error in the numbers. But there is no necessity for this. Most commentators and chronologists, and the best of them, regard the 35th year as referring not to the commencement of Asa's reign but to the separation of the kingdoms. In this case it would coincide with the fifteenth year of Asa's reign,

and the war would thus have broken out in the sixteenth, when Baasha was still alive. The objection, that there is no other instance in which the author of the Chronicles reckons the years from the division of the kingdom, may be removed, if we suppose that the source whence this account was taken by the author was one in which such a mode of reckoning was generally adopted. *Chronik.* p. 291—292).

Chap. xvi. 1. *He fortified Ramah* (the modern Ram, about five miles to the north of Jerusalem) *in order that they might give (or send) none going out or coming in to Asa;* that is to say, his intention was to prevent any towards the north from entering into alliance with Asa, and consequently to prevent Asa from forming an alliance with them. The high road from Jerusalem to the north passed by Ramah, and therefore the stoppage of this road must have interrupted the communication with Jerusalem in the most effectual manner. The infinitive תֵּת, which should follow לְבִלְתִּי according to the ordinary construction, cannot be rendered: *in order that Baasha might not give*, for what he wanted was to prevent freedom of communication.—The fortification of Ramah by Baasha presupposes his recovery of the cities, which had been taken by Abijah from the northern kingdom, and which according to chap. xv. 8 were still in Asa's possession.—V. 2. The account in 1 Kings xv. 18 is more elaborate and precise. (For vv. 2—6 see the Commentary on 1 Kings xv. 16—22). V. 6. In Jeremiah xli. 9 there is a cistern mentioned, which Asa constructed in Mizpah on this occasion. By the fortification of Mizpah and Geba the road from the north to Jerusalem was fully secured.

Vv. 7—10. *Address of the prophet Hanani, and the manner in which Asa received his reproof.*—V. 7. The prophet Hanani is only met with here; his younger contemporary was the prophet Jehu the son of Hanani, whose sphere of labour was in the northern kingdom (1 Kings xvi. 1) and at a later period in the southern kingdom also (2 Chr. xix. 2). It is natural, therefore, to suppose that Jehu the son of Hanani was a son of the Hanani referred to here.—*And hast not relied upon Jehovah thy God* (chap. xiii. 18, xiv. 10), *therefore the army of the king of Aram has escaped out of thy hand:* the meaning is that if Asa had trusted in God, he would not only have defeated the army of

Baasha, but the army of the king of Damascus also, should the latter, which was greatly to be feared, be induced by his alliance with Baasha (v. 3) to make common cause with him and attack the southern kingdom. The first act of Asa, namely his attempt to dissolve the alliance between Damascus and the northern kingdom by means of silver and gold, and the appropriation of the treasures of the temple to that purpose, is blamed, because it indicated a want of faith; and the consequence of this want of faith had been the disappointment of the inspired prophet's hope, that Asa would gain a splendid victory over the king of Damascus on this occasion.—V. 8. By the help of God Asa would have been able to conquer the armies of Damascus; the proof of this is his victory over the large army of Zerach (cf. chap. xiv. 8—12). —V. 9. *For Jehovah, his eyes move round about over the whole earth,* to search for an opportunity of interposing with his miraculous power, *that he may show himself strong in those, whose heart is devoted to him* (see 1 Chr. xi. 10). לבבם שלם אליו is a relative clause governed directly by the preposition עם without אשר; cf. 1 Chr. xv. 12.—*Thou hast acted foolishly on this* (*i.e.,* on this occasion) *for henceforth thou wilt have wars,* whereas by a decisive victory thou wouldst have deprived both the northern kingdom and the kingdom of Damascus of the power and the means of attacking thee. In our historical books we have no account of the wars of Asa, referred to here.—V. 10. The prophetical address of Hanani must have spread discontent with Asa's conduct over a wide circle, for the king proceeded *to cast him into prison, and to punish* some *of the people;* in what way, the word used here (וירצץ; *Septuagint* καὶ ἐλυμήνατο; *Vulgate,* et interfecit de populo in tempore illo plurimos) does not enable us to determine. The explanatory parenthesis, *for in a rage with him at this* (on that account), is quite intelligible, as we may easily supply from the context the words, "*he acted thus.*"

Vv. 11—14. *Conclusion* (cf. 1 Kings xv. 23, 24).—V. 12. עד למעלה חליו, *his disease having reached a great height,* having become very violent. What was the nature of his disease in the feet we are not told. *Also in his disease he did not seek Jehovah;* seeking here includes the notion of turning to him with confidence, and this explains the fact that at first the verb is

followed by the accusative, and then in the antithetical clause, like all verbs denoting confidence, is construed with the preposition ב. The word גם refers to Asa's conduct in the war with Baasha; as he trusted then in human aid so did he now during his last illness. There is nothing to hinder us from assuming that this remark was occasioned by more precise accounts of Asa's conduct during his illness, and that it is not the fact that he consulted physicians, but the manner in which he relied upon physicians, that is here condemned.—V. 13. From a comparison between this verse and 1 Kings xv. 24 and 10, it is evident that the clause "*and he died in the forty-first year of his reign,*" is merely a loosely inserted supplementary statement, which would stand more appropriately *before* the words, *he lay with his fathers*.—V. 14. Asa had had his own private tombs excavated for himself (and his family) in the city of David, possibly because it was necessary to increase the number of the royal tombs. The nominative to מִלֵּא need not be Asa; it may be rendered thus: *which they had filled with incense and spices, that had been prepared by means of an ointment into an ointment-like mass;* the Pual מרקחים only occurs here; it is derived from the substantive רקח, and the participle Pual may denote that which has become a רקח by means of artificial preparations, an ointment-like mass. In the preparation of this they employed מרקחת, 1 Chr. ix. 30, a word which certainly denotes an *ointment;* whether it also denoted the cauldron used in the preparation of the ointment, as some commentators suppose, is very uncertain. מעשה, as we may see at once, must be interpreted according to Ex. xxx. 25, 35; earlier expositors supply רוקח from these passages, and render the words: by an ointment *of the work of the ointment-maker;* it is possible that מרקחת מעשה may be an abbreviated technical term, but it is just as possible that in this instance רוקח may have been left out of the text by mistake. *They kindled for him a very, very great fire* (chap. xxi. 9; Jer. xxxiv. 5); according to the latter passage the kindling of a fire, that is the burning of incense, was customary at the funerals of kings; all that is emphatically noticed here is the fact that an extraordinary quantity was burned when Asa was buried.

The notices of Asa's reign, which are only met with in the Chronicles, are set, as it were, in the framework supplied in the Book of Kings:

2 Chr. xiv. 1—4 = 1 Kings xv. 11, 12.
2 Chr. xiv. 5—xv. 15.
2 Chr. xv. 16—xvi. 6 = 1 Kings xv. 13—22.
2 Chr. xvi. 7—10.
2 Chr. xvi. 11—14 = 1 Kings xv. 23, 24.

The parallel sections are not word for word the same, but it is evident at once that they are derived from a common source. The Book of Kings gives merely a brief extract from a more ample source; and from the relation in which this extract stands to the elaborate account in the Chronicles, we may readily infer, that the notices of Asa, which are only given in the Chronicles, were contained, in part at least, in this source, and in fact in the order in which we have them in this book. There are also references in 1 Kings xv. 23 to the fortifications described in 2 Chr. xiv. 5 seq. and to Asa's prosperous wars, among which the war with Zerach must hold a prominent place. The accounts of the prophet Azariah ben Oded and Hanani may perhaps have been taken by the historian from another source. But he has also recast in his own way what he found in these sources, for we find the peculiar marks of his style and language spread over the whole of these chapters.

## 4. Chap. xvii.—Chap. xxi. 1.

### JEHOSHAPHAT.

Chap. xvii. *Jehoshaphat's anxiety for the security of his kingdom* (vv. 2 and 10—19); *his endeavours to root out idolatry and to spread both laws and the knowledge of religion among the people* (vv. 3—9.)—V. 1. *And he strengthened himself against Israel, i.e.*, against the northern kingdom; the words cannot be interpreted in any other way, the northern kingdom being called Israel in this passage (v. 4) and the southern Judah (v. 5). It

was not during the first years of his reign that Jehoshaphat became related to Ahab by marriage and formed an alliance with the northern kingdom (chap. xviii. 1), and it was during those years that the attitude of the northern kingdom rendered it necessary for the southern to make preparations for defence.—V. 2. The warlike preparations were the following, the fortresses of Judah were garrisoned with troops, and military posts (נצִיבִים 1 Chr. xi. 16) were established in the land of Judah and in the cities of Mount Ephraim which were subject to Jehoshaphat (cf. chap. xv. 8).—V. 3. *In the earlier ways of David his father*, the earlier ways, in contrast with the later (cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 29), refer to David's conduct during the early part of his reign; hence his conduct in his later years, in which the adultery with Bathsheba (2 Sam. xi. sqq.) and the numbering of the people occurred, is not to be taken into account in the comparison which is here established between Jehoshaphat and David. The *Baalim*, which are placed in contrast with *the God of his father* (David), are idol deities in general, Judg. ii. 11. *He sought not;* for the use of *lamed* after the verb see 1 Chr. xxii. 19.—V. 4. In the last clause "*and not after the doings of Israel*" we must supply the previous verb "*he walked;*" by *the doings of Israel* we are to understand the worship of Jehovah in the form of a small ox, or of the golden calves at Bethel and Dan, 1 Kings xii. 28 seq. According to v. 3 Jehoshaphat abstained from idolatry, and according to v. 4 from the worship of the northern kingdom also.—V. 5. Then God established the government *in his hand*, 2 Kings xiv. 5. As it is expressly stated that all Judah sent *presents* to Jehoshaphat (compare the presents of the Philistines, v. 11), we are naturally led to think of freewill-offerings, not of the ordinary taxes, which were paid to the royal treasury. The last clause of the verse occurs again in chap. xviii. 1 (cf. chap. i. 12).—V. 6. *His heart was high;* not, he was proud (chap. xxvi. 16, xxxii. 25), for so depreciatory a remark the context would by no means lead us to expect (vv. 3—6), nor is there any reason assigned for such an observation; moreover it would not tally with the sentence pronounced on Jehoshaphat's conduct in other parts of the chapters under review *e.g.* chap. xix. 3). We must take ויגבה therefore in a favourable sense: *his heart was exalted by the ways of Jehovah*, that is,

he walked in the ways of Jehovah himself and therefore possessed alacrity and firmness enough to promote the general diffusion of the worship of Jehovah in his kingdom by the destruction of idols. *And further* he took away from Judah the high places and the pillars; עוד refers to v. 3, he not only abstained from idolatry, but besides that he removed, &c. This is the explanation generally given by expositors, *Capellus* alone is of opinion that the reference here is to the pride of Jehoshaphat, the effect of which is said to have been that he did *not* put an end to idolatry in his kingdom, and in order to put this meaning into the verse he proposes to read ולא instead of ועוד; but he appeals without reason to chap. xx. 33 in defence of this alteration in the reading, for the statement, which we find there, "*the high places did not cease to exist*," is not at variance with that contained in the verse before us, "*he removed the high places*," cf. chap. xiv. 2. The announcement that Jehoshaphat abolished idolatry is most intimately connected with the account in vv. 7—9, in which we are informed of his efforts to spread the knowledge of the religion of Jehovah throughout his land. In the third year of his reign Jehoshaphat sent five princes, that is, five laymen of distinction, along with nine Levites and two priests, with instructions to travel through all the cities of Judah, *having with them the book of the law of Jehovah*, that they might give to the people everywhere accurate instruction in the laws. *Ben-chail*, according to the Hebrew text and the Vulgate, is a proper name; but the Syriac and Septuagint translators read בני־חיל τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν δυνατῶν; no doubt this is the only place in which we meet with Ben-chail as a proper name, but we need not feel any more hesitation to regard it as the name of a man, than Benchesed in 1 Kings iv. 10 and other similar names. The name *Tob-adonijah* in v. 8 we meet with in this passage alone. The men named here are not mentioned anywhere else in the historical books of the Old Testament. *The book of the law of Jehovah* is probably a term employed by the historian to denote our present Pentateuch, and even if this was not in existence in the time of Jehoshaphat in the form in which we have it now, there was certainly a collection of Mosaic laws, which the men whom Jehoshaphat sent through the land may have been commissioned to make known to the people.—V. 10.

Jehoshaphat had leisure to provide for the instruction of his people, as the neighbouring tribes did not venture to make war upon Judah. By this remark, in which we at once detect expressions peculiar to the historian ("*fear of Jehovah*," cf. chap. xiv. 13, xx. 29; "*all the kingdoms of the lands*," cf. chap. xii. 8; and many other passages), he takes up the thread of the narrative concerning Jehoshaphat's military power, which was dropt at v. 2.—V. 11. מן פלשתים must be taken as the subject: *and some of the Philistines brought.* כסף משא, not *silver of tribute*, as משא does not occur anywhere else in this signification, but *a great quantity of silver.* משא, that which is carried on men's shoulders (chap. xxxv. 3) or on the backs of beasts of burden (Isa. xlvi. 1), may mean *the burden*, *i.e.*, that which can only be carried, hence a large quantity; cf. chap. xx. 25, לאין משא. By the *Arbihim* we must understood Arabian tribes, which had probably sought the protection of Jehoshaphat after his conquest of Edom. In the reign of Jehoram (chap. xxi. 16) the Philistines and Arabians were once more dangerous enemies of the southern kingdom.—V. 12. The participle הולך before וגדל, like the infinitive (for example in Gen. viii. 3), indicates the continual increase of his strength. בירניות (only used here and chap. xxvii 4) a noun derived from the adjective בִּירָן, which is formed from בִּירָה, a *castle*, a word frequently met with in the historical books. On the *store-cities* see chap. viii. 4.—V. 13. מלאכה רבה ("much business," *Eng. V.*) must, from the context, refer to the works connected with the preparation and provisioning of the fortresses (*i.e.*, the cities of Judah), chap. xi. 11.—V. 14. The superscription, "*and this is their census according to the house of their fathers*," refers to the fact that the numbers about to be given were taken from an account of the warriors, who were arranged in the army according to their fathers'-houses.—*To Judah* belonged; in v. 17 there follows, "*and of Benjamin*" there were. *The princes of thousands* were the highest officers in command; there were three of them, and *Adnah* held the highest post. Attached to the different names we find after this only the shorter title "*the prince.*"—V. 15. על ידו refers back to Adnah in v. 14; by the side of him, who commanded the largest division, Johanan and Amaziah had the

command of 280,000 and 200,000 men. Why Amaziah received the honourable distinction, "*he who had willingly given himself to Jehovah*," we are not informed. In the fuller account, from which this remark has been taken, there was no doubt some notice of a high-minded deed of Amaziah, which would explain the allusion, though now it is unintelligible.—V. 17. One company of the Benjamites consisted of archers, who are here described as *shooting with the bow* (cf. 1 Chr. xii. 2) *and* (armed with) *shields*, the word נשׁקי being made to refer by Zeugma to both מגן and קשׁת. Besides the archers, who always formed the principal force of the tribe of Benjamin (cf. Judges xix.—xx), the Benjaminites contributed 180,000 *equipped* men *of the army*, by which we understand the heavy armed soldiers in contradistinction from the archers. According to this account the army of Jehoshaphat was composed of five great divisions; Judah contributed 780,000 men in three divisions, and Benjamin 380,000 men in two divisions. The five divisions of the army may perhaps have been connected with some existing division of the provinces of Judah and Benjamin into five counties.—V. 19. Besides these five leading generals Jehoshaphat had other officers, who were entrusted with the command of the fortresses in the southern kingdom (*in all Judah*), where portions of the troops described above were no doubt stationed as garrisons.

Chap. xviii. *Jehoshaphat's connexion with Ahab by marriage; their joint attack upon Ramoth; death of Ahab.* Compare 1 Kings xxii. 2—35. (See the commentary on that passage).

Chap. xix. 1—3. *Sentence pronounced by the prophet Jehu on Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab.*—V. 1. Jehoshaphat *returned to his house in peace;* thus the prediction of Micah (chap. xviii. 16) was fulfilled.—V. 2. *Jehu the son of Hanani* (chap. xx. 34) had his sphere of action in the northern kingdom at the time of king Baasha (1 Kings xvi. 1); he may possibly have been banished from the northern kingdom, and compelled on that account to take up his abode in the southern.—*Should one help the wicked;* how couldst thou make common cause with Ahab? On the infinitive with *lamed* see 1 Chr. v. 1, ix. 25, &c. The accusative לשׂנאי, which is placed first for the sake of emphasis, has the *lamed* attached to it as the sign of the accusa-

tive. On the last clause of the verse, see 1 Chr. xxvii. 24. Instead of "*wrath from before Jehovah*" we find in 2 Chr. xxxii. 26, "the wrath of Jehovah." We are to regard the dangerous attack made by the eastern tribes (chap. xx. 1—30) as the consequence of the wrath, which Jehoshaphat had drawn upon himself by his conduct; but the danger passed over because (v. 3) "*there are, nevertheless, good things also found in thee*" (chap. xii. 12; 1 Kings xiv. 13). On the last clause see chap. xii. 14, xvii. 4.

V. 4—11. *Jehoshaphat's measures for securing a proper administration of justice.*—V. 4. וַיָּשָׁב *(and he turned back)* is to be taken in connexion with the following verb, thus: *then he went out again among the people; again,* for though it is not stated in chap. xvii. 7 sqq. that Jehoshaphat had personally gone out, yet these words may refer to the passage cited, so as to mean: he resumed his efforts for the instruction of the people. *Mount Ephraim* denotes the northern frontier of the southern kingdom. "And brought them back," see chap. xxiv. 19. As this reformatory movement had been already described, it is but briefly referred to here, so as to form a point of connexion between the account of the arrangements made for the administration of justice and the previous narrative (chap. xvii. 7—9).—V. 5. *The fortified cities* were appointed as the residences of the judges, because they were the central points for the traffic of the districts in which they were situated. לְעִיר וָעִיר *with reference to each particular city* (compare the law in Deut. xvi. 18). *Ye shall not judge for men, i.e.* not at their dictation or in compliance with their wishes, *but for Jehovah.* ועמכם בדבר משפט, these words are very obscure on account of their brevity, and they are variously rendered in the ancient versions; *e.g.* in the *Vulgate* they are given thus: *et quodcumque judicaveritis, in vos redundabit.* The simplest method is to supply the word "Jehovah" from the previous clause (compare the conclusion of v. 11 and chap. xx. 17): *and Jehovah be with you in the affair of justice (i.e.* in your decisions, Deut. xvii. 9), so that with a consciousness of his presence ye may earnestly seek that which is right. The next verse harmonises very well with this interpretation.—V. 7. שמרו ועשו, correctly translated in the *Vulgate, cum diligentia cuncta facite. For there is no injus-*

*tice, or regard of person, or receiving of presents with Jehovah,* and therefore this must not take place on the part of judges, who judge *for Jehovah* (see the law, Deut. xvi. 19).—V. 8. From this verse we may conclude, that in the fortified cities, (v. 5) as well as in Jerusalem, priests, Levites, and the heads of the fathers'-houses were appointed as judges. לישראל- with the *lamed* of direct dependence : *some of the heads of the fathers' houses* (1 Chr. viii. 6) *of the Israelites. He appointed the Levites,* &c. (1) *for the judgment of Jehovah,* or, as it is stated in v. 11, *for all matters of Jehovah,* for the affairs of religion and worship, *e.g.* to decide in any disputes with regard to the redemption of the first-born, or the payments to the temple, and in any questions as to purification; (2) *for the dispute,* or, as it is explained in v. 11, for all the king's matters, to give judgment in civil disputes or state prosecutions. וישבו ירושלם; this does not mean that the Levites and others, who had been appointed, *returned to Jerusalem,* for nothing has been said about their leaving Jerusalem, nor that those who sought for justice *went to Jerusalem,* for שוב does not mean to have recourse to; but it is a supplementary remark, induced by the recollection of the expression in v. 4, *he went out,* and means: *Jehoshaphat* (and those who had gone out with him) *returned to Jerusalem.*—V. 9, 10. The validity of the court of justice in Jerusalem is established. *Thus shall ye do in the fear of Jehovah,* &c.; what they are to do is mentioned in v. 10, where the words כה תעשון are repeated in the last clause. The ו before כל-ריב is wanting in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. The connexion between the announcement in v. 9 and the account in v. 10 becomes more apparent if we erase it from the Hebrew text: *thus shall ye do, every dispute which come before you,* &c. *Those of your brethren who dwell in their cities* (and wish for a decision, or for instruction on the part of the supreme court in the following matters); cf. Deut. xvii. 8. It follows as a matter of course that the dwellers in their cities included the inhabitants of Jerusalem. בין דם לדם *between blood and between blood* (*ben* followed by *lamed,* cf. Gen. i. 6); if there is any dispute respecting a murder or a homicide, and an uncertainty as to which of the laws given in Ex. xxi. 12 sqq. is applicable to the

case; cf. Deut. xvii. 8. *And between law and between commandment, between statutes and between judgments;* this might be expressed more briefly thus: בֵּין־תּוֹרָה לְתוֹרָה, but instead of the second *Thorah,* the different elements of which the Thorah was composed are given. The meaning is: if there be any dispute as to the interpretation or application of the laws; in Deut. xvii. 8, two particular cases are mentioned instead of the general notice given here. *Thus shall ye instruct them* (viz. those who bring the dispute before you) *that they trespass not against Jehovah,* for first of all they would trespass by a false application and interpretation of the laws, and then they would involve the whole nation in guilt as well; and (in this case) *there will be wrath upon you and your brethren,* even upon all Israel. *Thus shall ye do* (viz. according to v. 9 in the fear of Jehovah) *that ye may not trespass.*—V. 11. The high-priest Amariah is described in 1 Chr. v. 37 as the fifth high-priest from Zadok the contemporary of David; and Jehoshaphat the king was also the fifth king from David. *Zebadiah the prince of the house of Jehovah* is only mentioned in this passage. For *the matters of Jehovah* and *the king's matters,* compare v. 8.—עֲלֵיכֶם they shall be *over you,* as your presidents, the *Levites shall be officers before you,* as your assistants and servants; a few only of the Levites were appointed as judges, together with some priests, and heads of fathers'-houses (v. 8). The officers of justice, scribes, &c., were also to be taken from the remaining body of Levites. *Be strong and work;* work with strength (cf. v. 7, "take heed and do)." *With the good;* if ye endeavour to fulfil the duties of your office as good judges (cf. v. 6).

Chap. xx. 1—30. *Invasion on the part of the Eastern nations; they destroy one another, and thus perish without being defeated by Jehoshaphat and the Jews.*—V. 1. *Hillerus* (Onom.) says that the מהעמונים must have been the nation of the Meunites; in the Septuagint (καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν Μιναιῶν) the translators have adopted neither the reading מהעמנים, which is perfectly unintelligible and not in accordance with vv. 10, 22, and 23, nor the thoroughly suitable reading מֵהַמְּעוּנִים.—On the settlements of the Meunites see 1 Chr. iv. 41; in the further course of the narrative they are designated inhabitants of Mount Seir, v. 23,

or called by the name of their country, the mountains of Seir, vv. 10, 22. *Josephus* (Antiquities ix. 1, 2) speaks of them as a great multitude of Arabs.—V. 2. There *came* (fugitives and messengers) מארם; as they invaded Judah from the country to the east and south east of the Dead Sea (מעבר לים) they cannot have come straight from Aram: it has been said that they were accompanied by troops from *Aram*, from the Syrian provinces, but there is nothing to this effect in the narrative. Earlier expositors (*e.g. Calmet*) admitted that for *Aram* we should read *Edom;* the Septuagint and Vulgate have the false reading *Aram*, but the Syriac appears to have read Edom, (the clause is rendered thus: from the remote districts by the Red Sea). The hostile tribes marched round the southern point of the Dead Sea, and entered Judah from Edom. *Hazazon-tamar, which is Engedi*, cf. Gen. xiv. 7; the situation of Engedi has been accurately described by *Robinson* (ii. 439, 440), *Lynch* and others.—V. 3. *Jehoshaphat set his face* (he resolved, cf. 2 Kings xii. 18; Jer. xlii. 15) *to seek Jehovah, i.e.* to turn to him and implore his aid (chap. xv. 12, 13), and the consequence of his resolution was that he summoned all the inhabitants of his kingdom to meet at the sanctuary for a solemn fast (cf. Judges xx. 26; Joel. ii. 15).—V. 4. *To ask of Jehovah;* we naturally supply the word "*help*" (cf. Ezra viii. 21). At the end. of the verse we find the words "*to seek the Lord*" in almost the same sense, chap. xi. 16. The numerous attendance at the assembly is thus described: "and Judah (that is, the inhabitants of the southern kingdom) gathered themselves together, even *out of all the cities of Judah* they came."—V. 5. *In the assembly of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the other inhabitants of the southern kingdom;* the former are specially mentioned again in v. 27 (see also Is. i. 1, and ii. 1) as constituting the most important part of the whole population. *Before the new court, i.e.* before the outer court, so that Jehoshaphat stood in front of those who were assembled there, when he offered the prayer vv. 6—12. From this it is evident that the new court must denote the place in which the congregation assembled, that is the outer court; at least this was Solomon's arrangement, for in chap. iv. 9 it is expressly stated that he built the great, *i.e.* the outer court. The name "*new* court" must therefore have

been given to it at a later period, possibly in the time of Jehoshaphat, either because it was enlarged, or from its being rebuilt. With the prayer of Jehoshaphat compare the prayer of Asa, chap. xiv. 10.—V. 6. Cf. 1 Chr. xxix. 12. *There is no one near thee so as to be able to offer resistance, i.e.*, according to chap. xiv. 10, thou alone canst resist the powerful enemies, who have attacked us; these words of course imply that they cannot resist God: the same verb is used in 2 Sam. xxi. 5 with this signification.—V. 7. cf. Gen. xiii. 15 seq., xv. 18—21.—V. 8. The promise was fulfilled: "the Israelites dwelt in the land of Palestine, and built therein a sanctuary for thy name (chap. vi. 8, 5, 6), *saying*," *i.e.* expressing their confident expectation in the words of v. 9.—V. 9. A brief summary of the particular cases described in Solomon's prayer chap. vi. 22—39. שְׁפוֹט stands by itself in the list, and is not dependent on the other words (not *gladius judicii*, Vulgate; cf. Lev. xxvi. 25); hence it can only mean *judgment, judicial punishment* (LXX. κρίσις, Syr. ܕܝܢܐ); the word occurs nowhere else. *Then will we come before this house and before thee*: assembling in the court and turning our faces to the temple, in which thou dwellest.—Vv. 10, 11. Such a calamity has now befallen us: tribes, *into the midst of whom thou wouldst not let the Israelites come* (*i.e.*, to enter their land), *when they came out of Egypt*, and (though they were strong enough to destroy them) *thou didst not suffer it*, for (merely in obedience to thy command) *they* (the Israelites) *kept far away from them and did not destroy them*—and *behold they* (the ungrateful tribes) *requite us by coming to drive us out of thine inheritance, which thou hast caused us to inherit* (cf. v. 7). The Edomites (the Meunites, v. 1, were inhabitants of Mount Seir, *i.e.*, of the land of Edom) refused to allow the Israelites to pass through their land (Num. xx. 14—21), but the Israelites were ordered to abstain from any hostilities against Edom (Deut. ii. 5 seq.), and also against Moab (ii. 9) and Ammon (ii. 19); see Judges xi. 17 seq. with reference to Edom and Moab.—V. 12 cf. chap. xiv. 10. *And we, we know not what to do*, in the consciousness of our weakness in contrast with our powerful foes we are in utter despair.—V. 13. cf. Judith iv. 9, 10.—V. 14. *Jahaziel*, one of the sons of Asaph, and therefore a Levite, is suddenly filled with the

spirit of Jehovah in the midst of the ceremony and stands forward as a prophet. He was the fifth in descent from a *Mattaniah*, not the Mattaniah mentioned in 1 Chr. xxv. 4, 16 as a contemporary of David, for *he* was a descendant of Heman. There is a Nethaniah, whose name occurs in 1 Chr. xxv. 2, 12, among the sons of Asaph, and by the change of *nun* into *mem* this might easily have been altered into Mattaniah.—V. 15—17. The prophet calls upon the king and all present, to go forth the following day to meet the foe, that they may be witnesses of their destruction by the hand Jehovah.—V. 15. *Be not afraid nor dismayed;* the two Hebrew verbs employed in this passage are found together in 1 Chr. xxii. 13, Deut. i. 21, and many other places.—V. 16. The names Hazziz and Jeruel are not met with any where else, but the situation is clearly described: from Engedi (v. 2) the enemy marched towards Jerusalem, advancing along the mountain road Hazziz, which led up to a Wady (הנחל), at the upper end of which they found themselves before the desert of Jeruel. According to v. 20 the latter was not far from the desert of Tekoa, which stretches away to the south east of Jerusalem, and therefore the desert of Jeruel is to be regarded as a continuation of that of Hazziz. The mountain road Hazziz must therefore have passed through one of the Wadys, which run from the level country on the west of the Dead Sea, through the mountains forming its western border, to the neighbourhood of Engedi (*Robinson* ii. p. 410). The desert of Jeruel may be supposed to be the "large flat district called el-Husâsah from a Wady on its northern side" of which Robinson speaks in ii. p. 480. "The name Hazziz (Septuagint Ἀσσεῖς) has probably been retained in that of the present Wady Husasah; . . . . for there is no necessity to suppose that the ה is part of the article" (*Ewald*, Gesch. 190).—V. 17. *Ye must not fight in this; i.e.*, because Jehovah himself will fight, compare chap. xix. 2 for the expression "*in this*"). עמכם is appended as a dependent relative clause: *the help of Jehovah who is with you.*—V. 18 seq. Account of the joyful thanksgiving for the glorious promise: the king and all the congregation bow low before Jehovah, the Levites then rise up first to praise God with a loud voice. There is something striking in the expression "*of the Kohathites and of the Korahites*," as the latter belonged to the descendants of Kohath,

(1 Chr. vi. 22).—V. 20 seq. According to the prophet's command the assembled Israelites went the next day, not to fight but to be witnesses of the miraculous deliverance effected by Jehovah. Jehoshaphat stood there (probably in the gate of Jerusalem, where the people assembled preparatory to departing), and with solemn words exhorted them to believe in Jehovah and his prophets (the Hiphil and Niphal האמינו and תאמנו occur together in the same way in Is. vii. 9, cf. Deut. i. 32; Is. xxviii. 16), and having thus exhorted the people he arranged the solemn procession "*he appointed singers of Jehovah* (not *the* singers of Jehovah, but singers generally, hence the word is not in the construct state but governed indirectly by *lamed*, as in the expression *mizmor l'David*, a Psalm of David), who *sang praises in sacred costume on their going out in front of the army and said, &c.*—V. 22. החלו the relative is indispensable in such a connection: *at the time when they began the singing and praise, Jehovah placed* מארבים *against the sons of Ammon, &c., and they destroyed one another*, in the manner described in v. 23. It is evident from the context, that מארבים can only mean angels, powers sent by God, who were called *insidiatores* on account of the part they had to perform in relation to the army of the hostile tribes. This is the explanation given by the earlier expositors (cf. *Rambach* in loco) and by *Ewald* (Gesch. p. 190). We only observe in addition that the מארבים cannot have been Jews placed in ambush, for, according to vv. 15 and 17, the Jews were not to fight, but to be simply witnesses of the destruction effected by divine power; nor can they have been certain portions of the army of the Moabites, Ammonites, and inhabitants of Mount Seir, who destroyed the rest of the army, for the *Mearbim* do not fight, they only cause the different parts of the hostile army to fight one against another.—V. 23. First Moab and Ammon combined together and fell upon the inhabitants of Mount Seir for the purpose of utterly destroying them (Dan. xi. 44), *and when they had finished among* (or in the midst of) *the inhabitants of Seir they helped to destroy one another*, (Moab and Ammon turned their weapons against each other). משחית is a substantive, it occurs also in chap. xxii. 4; Dan. x. 8; Ezek. v. 16.—V. 24. Thus had the army completed its own destruction during the time occupied by the Jewish procession in

going from Jerusalem to the spot, from which the battle-field could be seen. המצפה is not a watch-tower here, but an elevated situation, the summit of a hill which overlooked the desert of Jeruel (v. 16). ואין פליטה *not one having escaped;* not one survived, they all lay there dead.—V. 25. Thus according to the word of the prophet the Jews had not to fight at all, but were able to proceed at once to take possession of the immense amount of booty. בהם *among them* or with them. לרב, *in abundance,* is the accusative of the object meaning "*an abundance.*" The words *recush* and *pegarim* could not be rendered in any other way than "*live animals*" and "*dead animals,*" for as *pegarim* in v. 24 is used to denote the human corpses, and it is evident that they must have lain upon the field of battle, the only dead bodies of which we could possibly think here are the carcases of animals whose trappings and hides may certainly have constituted a booty of no little value. Some MSS. and many old editions (including the Bibl. Brix. employed by *Luther*) read בגדים for פגרים; the *Vulgate* and apparently the *Septuagint* adopt the same reading. In other lists of articles carried off as booty we are generally accustomed to find *clothes* mentioned; and as the alteration of *begadim* into *pegarim* could easily occur, the latter word having been written just before, we need not hesitate to accept *begadim* as the original reading. The רכוש, *moveable goods* (such as cattle, tents, &c.), and the *valuable articles* (cf. Judg. viii. 26) are then appropriately noticed in connection with the *clothes.* לאין משא, they plundered for themselves *till there was no loading,* to such an extent that they could not carry the booty away.—V. 26. *The valley of blessing,* according to these verses, must be looked for near the battle-field, for the Jews, who had been engaged for three days in collecting plunder, assembled on the fourth day in this valley, for the purpose of returning to Jerusalem in solemn procession and betaking themselves to the temple, v. 27 seq. In the neighbourhood of the battle-field there is still to be seen not only a hill called *Kaphar-Barucha,* of which *Jerome* speaks (cf. *Reland* Pal. 356. 685), but at a short distance off a place called *Bereikut,* which has been discovered by modern travellers (*Robinson* iii. 2 p. 863, *Wilkinson,* the lands of the Bible 1. p. 386) and a *Wady Bereikut* (*Wollcott's* Excursion. *C. Ritter* Erdkunde pt. 15. p. 635). As the ancient name

"*Valley of blessing*" is apparently retained in the Wady Bereikut, and the situation of the Wady squares with the places mentioned in this section, and on the other hand as there is not a word to indicate that the festival in *the valley of blessing* was celebrated in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, we cannot subscribe to the opinion held by those, who consider that the *valley of blessing* was "the valley of Kidron, on the road back to Jerusalem from the desert of Tekoa, to which valley, at least where it touches Jerusalem, tradition continues to give the name of "valley of Jehoshaphat" (*Thenius* cf. *Hitzig* on Joel). When *Joel* (chap. iii. 2. 12) calls the place of the grand divine decision the valley of Jehoshaphat, he does so no doubt because the destruction of the enemies of Israel, which was effected by the miraculous interposition of God in the time of King Jehoshaphat, floated before his mind as a type of the future judgment, but it does not follow from this that the valley, which is now called the valley of Jehoshaphat, must be the same as the valley of blessing mentioned here. The name "valley of Jehoshaphat" does not occur anywhere in the Old or New Testament as the name of a portion of the valley of Kidron, nor is it so called in the works of *Josephus*, though *Eusebius* knew it by that name (cf. Robinson ii. p. 31 sqq).—V. 27. *For Jehovah had given them joy;* the same expression occurs in Ezra vi. 22 and Nehem. xii. 43.—V. 28. The same ceremony was observed on their return as on their departure (v. 21).—V. 29. *There was a dread of God over all the kingdoms of the countries;* compare chap. xvii. 10, where it is clearly stated that the countries intended are those round about Judah, though we should naturally infer that no others could be meant.—V. 30. On the last clause see chap. xv. 15.

V. 31 to Chap. xxi. 1. *Further notices of Jehoshaphat, by which his history is brought to a close* (vv. 31—34 and chap. xxi. 1). *These accounts are divided by a supplementary notice of the fitting out of ships in Ezion-Geber*, vv. 35—37. Vv. 31—33. cf. 1 Kings xxii. 41—44. V. 31. The words "*Jehoshaphat reigned over Judah*" we have already met with in chap. xvii. 1; they are repeated here to serve as an introduction to the notices which follow respecting Jehoshaphat's age when he began to reign, and the number of years that he sat upon the throne.

V. 32. Instead of ממנה we find in 1 Kings the masculine ממנו; דרך occurs as both masculine and feminine. (See chap. xvii. 3).—V. 33. *But the high places they* (the inhabitants of the southern kingdom) *did not remove*, a statement which is not at variance with chap. xvii. 6, where we read "*moreover he took away the high places*" (see the remarks on that passage). The words "*as yet the people had not firmly directed their hearts unto the God of their fathers*," refer, as the context clearly shows, to the fact that Jehovah was not only worshipped in Jerusalem, but upon the high places also; hence they are substantially the same as those which we find in the parallel passage in 1 Kings: *the people still offered and burnt incense in the high places.* V. 34. *The earlier and the later;* the same expression occurs in 1 Chr. xxix. 29.—Vv. 35—37. *Vessels fitted out at Ezion-Geber;* compare 1 Kings xxii. 48—50, where we find the introductory remark, "*no king had been appointed king in Edom*," the intention of which is to show that as Jehoshaphat ruled over the land of Edom, he was therefore able to fit out vessels in the Edomitish harbour of Ezion-Geber. Whether Jehoshaphat had once more subdued the land of Edom by means of successful wars, or whether he "prudently availed himself of disputes which had arisen in Edom with regard to the succession, and thus established the supremacy of Judah over Edom" (*Thenius*), or whether Edom, notwithstanding its revolt in the time of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 14 sqq.) still remained subject to the Israelites, and all that Jehoshaphat did was to display greater force in the government, which the southern kingdom had exercised over Edom from the time when the nation was divided, our historical books do not enable us to determine.—V. 35. The loose connection "*after this*" contains merely an indefinite statement as to the time, cf. chap. xx. 1; if Ahaziah was king of the northern tribes in the seventeenth year of the reign of Jehoshaphat and reigned only two years (1 Kings xxii. 52), the fitting out of the ships must have taken place in the 17th or 18th year of Jehoshaphat. אתחבר the Aramaean form of הִתְחַבֵּר. *He*, viz. Jehoshaphat, *acted wrongly;* the context shows that the purport of these words is to blame Jehoshaphat for his connection with the king of the northern kingdom (cf. chap. xix. 2); earlier ex-

positors regarded them as directed against Ahaziah, ***cujus opera erant impiisima (Vulgate)***.—V. 36. ***And he joined himself with him to build ships to go to Tarshish;*** in 1 Kings we read of ***ships of Tarshish***, (*i.e.*, large ships, such as were built to sail to the distant port of Tartessus), which were to sail to Ophir; but here we find, instead of ships of Tarshish, ***ships which were designed to sail to Tarshish***, with which design their being built in Ezion-Geber would only harmonize, provided the name of Tarshish is used by the historian to denote that distant eastern country which is usually called Ophir; (compare chap. viii. 18 and ix. 21. See also the totally different explanation given by *Keil* in the commentary on 1 Kings xxii. 48. TR.)—V. 37. The form of the word דֹּדָוָהוּ reminds us of the names Hodaviah and Joshaviah, but it stands quite isolated in this passage, and is very striking; *Δωδία*, the name given in the Septuagint, points to the intelligible form דּוֹדִיָּהוּ *friend of God;* the *Vulgate* read *Dodau*, the Syriac *Dodo* (in the latter the passage is rendered, ***Eliezer the son of his relative***). ***Mareshah***, cf. 1 Chr. ii. 42. The perfect פָּרַץ in the prophet's address denotes that which will certainly come to pass. *Keil* (p. 308 seq.) endeavours to harmonise the different accounts given in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, or rather he keeps them distinct and refers them to different transactions (see the commentary on Kings, Vol. i. p. 329). Chap. xxi. 1. The last clause, "***and Jehoram his son reigned in his stead***," forms the commencement of the history of Jehoram (cf. chap. xvii. 1); in other places (*e.g.*, chap. xxiv. 27) they can stand at the end of a verse as they do here.

The brief account of the reign of Jehoshaphat, given in the Book of Kings, is amplified in many respects by the fuller history contained in the Chronicles, which must rest upon definite historical traditions. For (1) in the description of the course adopted by him for spreading the knowledge of the law and securing the due administration of justice among his people, the various details and the names (including that of the high priest Amariah, chap. xix. 11, whom we learn from other sources to have been a contemporary of Jehoshaphat), contain the surest evidence that exact accounts were found by the historian in the documents which he employed. If he worked up the historical

material in his own way (see *e.g.* xvii. 10, xix. 7, 9, and other passages particularly in the words of Jehoshaphat, chap. xix. 6—11), there is no ground for the assumption, that the author desired to increase the importance attached to the institutions of a latter period, by attributing their origin to a pious king of an earlier age; for the names of the men, appointed by Jehoshaphat, were evidently known solely in connection with these arrangements, and they have been handed down to us simply because the historians of a later age felt an interest in describing their official labours.—(2) The same may be said of the preparations made for the defence of the country and the organization of the army, see especially chap. xvii. 15—19.—(3) In the remarkable account of the war, in which the Moabites, the Ammonites, and the Meunites destroyed one another (chap. xx. 1—30), we find, it is true, on every hand the style and language peculiar to our historian (compare *e.g.*, Jehoshaphat's prayer, chap. xx. 6—12 with that of Asa, chap. xiv. 10, the infinitives with *lamed*, chap. xx. 6, 17, למעלה, chap. xx. 19, &c.), but we meet also with historical notices of a very definite character: the localities are minutely described, vv. 16—20; the term "*new court*" is only met with in v. 5, (it must have been taken from a source, in which its recent erection was noticed). The list of ancestors of the Levite Jahaziel (v. 14) is a proof of the fact, that he had attracted the attention of the early historians, who were still in a position to give an account of his pedigree. This exterminating struggle floated before the mind of the prophet Joel, when he called the place of the divine decision the valley of Jehoshaphat (cf. chap. xx. 26). The opinion has been expressed, that in the narrative before us we have merely the shorter account of 2 Kings iii. 25 seq. freely remodelled, but in the Chronicles some of the events described are totally different from those referred to in the Book of Kings, and it is impossible to see how the latter can have supplied a starting point or historical foundation for the statements contained in 2 Chr. xx. Lastly (4) the historian must have had before him notices of the labours of the prophets Jehu and Eliezer (chap. xix. 2, 3, and xx. 37), though he puts the substance of their addresses into his own words (cf. the infinitive with *lamed* and קצף, chap. xix. 2, "*good things*" and "*firmly directing the heart*" chap. xix. 3).—The brief account

in 1 Kings apparently refers to the substance of some of the narratives in the Chronicles: in 1 Ki. xxii. 47 the extermination of idolatry (2 Chr. xvii. 3—6) is noticed; in 1 Ki. xxii. 46 there is a reference to Jehoshaphat's military power, of which we have a more elaborate account in 2 Chr. xvii. 2, 10—19. Again in sections, which we do also find in the Book of Kings, though there are not wanting certain alterations and additions on the part of our historian, yet on the whole they are given in the form in which he found them in the sources he employed. The history of Jehoshaphat, as it lies before us, has not been cast in one mould; the historian followed his sources so closely, that he did not always connect together sections which were intimately related, but took different paragraphs from different sources, and set them down in the connection in which he found them.

## 5. CHAP. XXI. 2—20.

### JEHORAM.

V. 2—4. Jehoshaphat had appointed Jehoram his first-born as his successor; his other six sons, like Rehoboam, he had richly endowed (cf. chap. xi. 22 seq.), and had given them the command of some of the fortified cities. Two of the six were named *Azariah;* but there is sufficient difference in the spelling of the Hebrew names to distinguish the one from the other, the one being spelt Azarja, the other Azarjahu. *Jehiel* was supposed by early Jewish expositors to be the same person as the Hiel mentioned in 1 Kings xvi. 34, but this is not correct, for the latter was a native of Bethel in the northern kingdom.—V. 4. *And Jehoram stood over (i.e.* governed) *the kingdom of his father and strengthened himself* (chap. i. 1). We are not told what it was that induced Jehoram to kill his brethren (cf. v. 13); he slew *some of the princes of Israel* as well, *i.e.* princes of the tribes of Israel, belonging to the southern kingdom, from which we may conclude that Jehoram had to contend against internal divisions and commotions, which may have been stirred up by the brethren themselves, or may possibly have originated in their murder by Jehoram.

Vv. 5—10. (cf. 2 Kings viii. 17—22, and see the commentary on that passage).

Vv. 11—19. *The letter of Elijah and infliction of the sufferings predicted in it.* The occasion of the letter (v. 12—15) is mentioned in v. 11. Not only did Jehoram forsake the God of his fathers, he *also* established *high places on the mountains* of Judah (the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* read "in the cities of Judah);" this must have been for the Phoenician gods, for the word ויזן *(he led away to adultery)* refers to the introduction of Phoenician idolatry (cf. v. 13). וידח *he led* them away *by force from the right way;* this must be explained from Deut. xiii. 6, 11, 14.—V. 13. The Hiphil of זנה occurs nine times in the Old Testament, but only three times in the Chronicles, twice in this verse and once in v. 11. כהזנות בית אחאב; *as the house of Ahab seduced to adultery* (cf. v. 6). *Thy brethren;* cf. v. 4. —V. 14. *The great plague,* announced here, refers to the conquest of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians (v. 16 seq.). —V. 15. *And thou* (wilt be) *in great pain from a disease in thy bowels;* compare the fulfilment of this threat in v. 18. The chronological notice, ימים על ימים *one number of days to another* (just like Is. xxix. 1, *year to year*), renders it probable that the course of the disease up to the time of Jehoram's death occupied a period of two years (cf. v. 18).—V. 16. *Stirred up the spirit of the Philistines* (cf. 1 Chr. v. 26). *The Arabs who* (dwell) *by the side of the Cushites* were Arabian tribes from the southern districts.—V. 17. בקע *to split, to open,* hence to conquer cities (chap. xxxii. 1), here with reference to the conquest of the land of Judah. It is evident from what follows that they conquered Jerusalem also. לבית־המלך, indirect government by means of *lamed: all the discovered property of the king's house;* compare the dependence indicated by the construct state which was not admissible here on account of the article, and the adjective attached to the substantive (see chap. xii. 9). *Except Jehoahaz the youngest of his sons;* in chap. xxii. 1—9 he is called Ahaziah, which name he probably first received, when he became king; on the chronological notice see chap. xxii. 2.—V. 18. לחלי, a second accusative with the government indicated by *lamed: Jehovah smote him in his bowels with a disease.* לאין,

מרפא, still more definitely expressed in chap. xxxvi. 16, "*so that there was no cure.*—V. 19. *And it came to pass at days of days,* when out of a long series of days many had passed away; the same idea is conveyed more briefly by מִיָּמִים alone in Judg. xi. 4, xiv. 8, xv. 1. But this indefinite statement was not sufficient, for the purpose of the writer was to show that the prediction in v. 15 was fulfilled as to the exact period also; he therefore adds, "*and* (in fact) *at the time of the arrival of the end of two times* (we render ימים, a number of days, somewhat more clearly by times), or two periods of time, the extent of which is certainly not stated, but which we do not hesitate to regard as years. The *Vulgate,* the *Syriac,* and most of the commentators give as the translation *two years,* but the text of the original is not לִשְׁנָתַיִם ימים (*e.g.* 2 Sam. xiii. 23); it is only in the *Septuagint* that the exact rendering is given. לימים שנים has, therefore, the same meaning as ימים על ימים in v. 15. עם חליו *in his disease* can only mean while his disease lasted, so that his suffering continued to the very last. The תחלאים רעים are *bad, grievous pains. His people instituted no burning* for him (see on the other hand chap. xvi. 14); the nation made known its sentence upon the deceased monarch by refusing the usual honours at his burial.—V. 20. *Conclusion;* 2 Kings viii. 17. וילך בלא חמדה *discessit a nemine desideratus;* the Vulgate, on the contrary, gives *ambulavit non recte,* but חמדה does not mean good conduct. *But not in the sepulchres of the kings;* a more precise statement, which is not found in the Book of Kings.

## 6. Chap. xxii. 1—9.

### AHAZIAH.

V. 1; taken from the same source as chap. xxi. 11—19. הראשנים, the elder sons in contradistinction to the youngest one. *The band, which came to the camp along with the Arabians* (probably to the camp of the Jews); we understand this obscure passage to mean that Ahaziah's brothers were attacked

and slain by a band of wild men, who served in the army of the Arabians, possibly against the will of the leaders of the Philistines and Arabians, chap. xxi. 16.

Vv. 2—6. (cf. 2 Kings viii. 26—29.)—V. 2. The age assigned to Ahaziah when he began to reign, forty-two years, does not tally with chap. xxi. 20 and 2 Kings viii. 17; for according to these passages his father Jehoram was thirty-two years old, when he ascended the throne, and reigned eight years. Instead of forty-two we find in 2 Kings twenty-two years old (the latter reading is adopted by the *Syriac* and *Arabic* in the passage before us, but the *Septuagint* says he was twenty years old). The best accredited reading, which we must insert in our text also, is twenty-two years. According to this Jehoram begat Ahaziah, when he was seventeen years old, which would still leave it a remarkable fact that in chap. xxi. 17 and xxii. 1 he is called the youngest son. It is possible that Jehoram may have had other sons before the birth of Ahaziah, though they may have had different mothers, but we can hardly suppose that he was the youngest of forty-two brethren (2 Kings x. 13 seq.) —(On this *Keil* says, "the two accounts in 2 Kings x. 13—14, and 2 Chr. xx. 1—8 can easily be reconciled when we consider the latitude allowed to the use of the word אח. The expression includes grandsons and other near relatives." Apol. Versuch, p. 414).—*Daughter of Omri*, more exactly granddaughter of Omri; the intention of the writer was simply to show that she was a member of the idolatrous dynasty of Omri.—Vv. 3, 4, given more briefly and in somewhat different words in 2 Kings viii. 27. *His counsellor to do wickedly;* she induced him to join in the idolatry of the northern kingdom, and to enter into alliance with that kingdom, chap. xx. 35. *For they* (the members of the house of Ahab, who were related to him on his mother's side), *they were his counsellors after his father's death;* this simply means that the weak-minded king allowed himself to be swayed by his mother's relations. *To his destruction;* chap. xx. 23. The destruction which came upon him is described in v. 9.—V. 5. *He also walked after their counsel;* the meaning of these words, which are wanting in 2 Kings, evidently is, that Ahaziah went with Joram to the war, hence they establish the correctness of the reading in Kings, "*he went with Joram.*" *Hazael,*

a courtier or commander-in chief of Ben Hadad, and subsequently his successor in the government (2 Kings viii. 8 sqq., xiv. 28). *Ramoth in Gilead*, see 2 Chr. xviii. 28. *The Aramæans smote Joram;* according to v. 6 this is equivalent to "*they wounded him.*" הרמים contracted from הָאֲרַמִּים.—V. 6. *In Jezreel* (now called Zerin, *Robinson* iii. 393 seq.), not in Samaria, the capital; possibly they could not take the wounded king farther than Jezreel. In the place of the thoroughly unintelligible expression כִּי־הַמַּכִּים, we must adopt the reading of Kings, מן־המכים, which good MSS. contain in this passage as well. *Azariah;* hardly another name for Ahaziah, who has already been called by a second name Jehoahaz in chap. xxi. 17; it is merely an error of the pen for Ahaziah, and this name is found in the versions and some of the MSS. *He went down* "from Ramoth, which stands upon an eminence, so that the war was now carried on by the generals." (*Thenius*).

V. 7—9. Compare the more extended account in 2 Kings, chaps. ix. and x. (See also the commentary on that passage. Tr.)

## 7. Chap. xxii. 10—xxiii. 21.

### ATHALIAH, AHAZIAH'S MOTHER.

Vv. 10—12. *Athaliah seizes upon the government.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 1—3.

Chap. xxiii. 1—11. *Jehoiada caused Joash to be proclaimed king.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 4—12.

Vv. 12—15. *Athaliah comes to the temple, and is murdered outside the gates.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 13—16.

Vv. 16—21. *Oath of fidelity to Jehovah administered; Joash is conducted to the palace in solemn procession.* Compare 2 Kings xi. 17—20.

(For chap. xxii. 10—xxiii. 21, see the commentary on 2 Kings xi. 1—20).

## 8. CHAP. XXIV.

### JOASH.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xii. 1—3.—Vv. 4—14. *The restoration of the temple and preparation of the necessary furniture.* Compare 2 Kings xii. 4—16. (See the commentary on Kings. TR.)

Vv. 15—22.—*Death of Jehoiada and apostasy of the people; appearance of the prophet Zechariah and his death.*—V. 15. According to 2 Kings xii. 7, Jehoiada was still engaged in building the temple in the twenty-third year of Joash, hence the events narrated here must belong to the later years of his reign. —V. 17. *They bowed before the king, i.e.* they presented their request in the most obsequious manner, that he would allow them to worship idols. And the weak-minded king did not venture to refuse the petition of the princes of Judah. It is not stated that he worshipped idols himself; he is only blamed for not strictly maintaining the worship of Jehovah. *There was wrath* (from Jehovah) *upon Judah and Jerusalem;* see chap. xxix. 8.—V. 19. Compare Nehem. ix. 26—29.—V. 20. Of the many prophets, who are said in v. 19 to have been sent by God into the midst of Israel, Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada the high priest, is the only one named. Under the power of prophetic inspiration he announced the punishment of God upon the faithless nation, and, by the command of the king, was stoned in the court of the temple. This is the Zechariah, who is called in Matth. xxiii. 35 the son of Barachiah, (cf. Luke xi. 51) *Above the people;* he stood, as we may infer from v. 21 and Matt. xxiii. 35, and addressed the people from the inner court, which was somewhat elevated, and thus he was raised above the people, who were assembled in the outer court. *And wherefore do ye not wish to prosper,* this is the proper rendering of the imperfect with לֹא; if they desired prosperity, they must observe the condition of prosperity, fidelity towards Jehovah. On the last clause see chap. xii. 5, xv. 2. The fulfilment of the threat is described in v. 24.—V. 21. The subject of the verbs is understood: the princes and the people. *In the court of the temple;*

the spot is more minutely described in the New Testament, namely between the temple and the altar, hence he was stoned close to the temple in a place that was peculiarly holy.—V. 22. "*But slew his son;*" Joash is described as the murderer, because his command (v. 21) rendered him guilty of the death of the son of Jehoiada. "*The Lord look upon it and avenge it;*" this prediction, which was uttered in the form of a wish, was afterwards fulfilled (v. 25 seq.).

Vv. 23—26. *Infliction of the punishments announced by Zechariah* (compare 2 Kings xii. 18—22).—Vv. 23, 24. A small army of Syrians defeated the numerous army of Joash. Many of the earlier expositors and *Thenius* assume, that the account given in these verses refers to a totally different occurrence from that described in 2 Kings xii. 18 seq. This is possible, but by no means probable. As neither the Book of Kings nor that of Chronicles refers to more than one campaign of the Syrians, in which the southern kingdom was thoroughly worsted, it is natural to assume that both accounts refer to the same campaign, especially as they complete each other in a most appropriate manner. For it is *a priori* probable, that Joash did not purchase peace by means of the heavy sacrifices, described in 2 Kings, till after a shameful defeat, and of this we have an account in the Chronicles alone. Moreover, the price paid for this peace explains the fact that the Syrians retired without prosecuting their victory further. —לתקופת השנה; that is, a year after Zechariah's death, when the recollection of that event must have been fresh in the minds of the people, and when, therefore, there was no room to doubt that the invasion of the Syrians was the punishment of their apostasy, which he had predicted. *To Jerusalem;* they came near the city to besiege it. *They destroyed all the princes of the people from the people;* the punishment fell upon the princes as the originators of the apostasy (v. 17). מעם has been left untranslated by the *Vulgate* and *Syriac*, the Septuagint has ἐν τῷ λαῷ; according to Ps. lxxxix. 20 the word is added to show that they were singled out from the body of the people, the people generally being spared. *The spoil of them;* as part of the spoil we may include the treasures which Joash is said in the Book of Kings to have handed over to the Syrians.—*Darmesek*, cf. chap. xvi. 2.—V. 24. On the other hand a small number of pious

Israelites had formerly defeated the very large army of the Ethiopians, chap. xiv. 10 seq.—*And they executed judgment on Joash;* in other cases the preposition *beth* is employed in such a connection (*e.g.*, Ezek. v. 10, 15), here את is used (like עשה טובה את 1 Sam. xxiv. 19): to execute judgment *with*, or at a person. These words refer to the disease and pain, with which Joash was afflicted. He had probably been wounded in the battle.—V. 25. *And when they departed from him—for* (he did not perish in the fight, as he deserved, but) *they left him in great pain, his own servants conspired against him*, &c. Instead of *the sons of Jehoiada* we must read "the son of Jehoiada" according to the text. This reading is adopted in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate*. The Makkeph has been altered by mistake into *Yod*. *And slew him;* they murdered him as a just retribution for having murdered Zechariah (cf. v. 22). They slew the sick monarch *in his bed*, according to 2 Kings in the Millo house. *They buried him in the city of David, but did not bury him in the sepulchres of the Kings;* in Kings we read, "they buried him by his fathers in the city of David." The two accounts are not at variance with each other; he was buried in the city of David, where his fathers were also buried, but not in the sepulchres of the kings. The design of the historian is to point out the fact that the king, who had permitted the apostasy from Jehovah and was guilty of the murder of Zechariah, was not thought worthy of the honour of resting in the sepulchres of the kings.—The names of the conspirators were *Jozakar* and *Jehozabad* according to 2 Kings, the former is called the *son of Shimeath*, who is described in this passage as an Ammonitess, the other was the *son of Shomer*, or, as it is spelt in this passage, the *son of Shimrith the Moabitess*.—V. 27. The Keri יִרֶב would have to be interpreted thus: and as regards his sons, may the utterance concerning him be increased, which might mean, may the wish expressed by the dying Zechariah (v. 22) be fulfilled in them in a still higher degree than in the case of his father. A later reader might look for some such meaning as this in the words, but it is evident that they are to be taken in a different sense. The *Syriac* and *Septuagint* (the latter read, instead of המשא, חמשה *five*) deviate very far from the Hebrew text, whereas the *Vulgate* follows it exactly. We render the passage thus: *and*

*his sons and the multitude* (Kethib ורב) *of the prophetic utterances with regard to him and the founding of the temple, behold they are written, &c. His sons* must have been celebrated for their deeds or their fate (cf. v. 3).—משא עליו has been referred by some to the tribute imposed upon him (2 Kings xii. 19); by others to the money which came in from the "collection (מַשְׂאַת) of Moses upon Israel," vv. 6 and 9 (but here we have עליו not על ישראל); by others again, according to 2 Kings ix. 25 and the fixed meaning of the word משא, to prophetic utterances. If there *were* such prophetic utterances in the work quoted here, this would explain the reference made by the historian in v. 19 to prophets in the time of Joash.

## 9. Chap. xxv.

### AMAZIAH.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xiii. 1—6. (See the commentary on Kings).

Vv. 5—10. *Amaziah's preparations for war; he hires mercenary troops from the northern kingdom, but sends them away again in consequence of the warnings of a prophet.* These notices, which are not found in the Book of Kings, form the introduction to the accounts in vv. 11—13.—V. 5. *He arranged them* (*i.e.* the whole of Judah and Benjamin) *by fathers'-houses, according to the princes of the thousands and the princes of the hundreds.* The members of the different fathers'-houses were first formed into companies under the princes of the thousands and hundreds. The words "*all Judah and Benjamin,*" which are shown to be in the accusative by the preposition "*lamed,*" are put in apposition to the accusative suffix in ויעמידם (Angl. "and made *them*"). The number of warriors in the time of Jehoshaphat (chap. xvii. 14—19) was much larger; according to the passage before us Amaziah collected together 300,000 heavy armed soldiers. Over the same number of גבורי חיל, whom we may suppose to have been heavy armed in distinction from the archers, Adna held the command in the time of Jehoshaphat, and besides him four other leaders of large bodies of troops are named. The great

difference in the numbers may perhaps be explained from the fact, that in this passage it was not intended to give the total number of the troops. It must also be borne in mind, as earlier expositors have suggested, that since the days of Jehoshaphat the southern kingdom had been engaged in disastrous wars, and hence in Amaziah's time could not have been in a position to raise an equally numerous army.—V. 7. *With Israel;* to prevent misunderstanding the clause, "with *all the sons of Ephraim,*" is placed afterwards in apposition.—V. 8. The versions give only a general notion of the contents of this verse, so that we cannot tell whether the translators had our present Hebrew text before them or not. The text, as we now have it, is quite unintelligible, for (1) the antithetical clause which is introduced with the words כִּי אִם can only mean: *but do thou come,* thou alone, and not the mercenary soldiers of the northern kingdom with thee; (2) the injunction חזק implies, that the king was to take courage and trust in God, and not in the hired troops; but, if the king yielded to the prophet's injunction, the prospect held out to him could not have been: God will bring thee into a snare, but, he will not lead thee into a snare. Hence we must adopt *Ewald's* suggestion and insert ולא in the text: *but do thou come alone, act, be strong* (show thyself strong) *with regard to the war, and God will not bring thee into a snare.* The arbitrary conjecture, that we are to supply: "but if thou wilt go to the war with the hired troops, God will bring thee into a snare," is not sufficient, for in that case we should have to complete the sense of the opening words of the verse by adding: and God will not bring thee into a snare.—V. 10. להגדוד, an accusative with *lamed,* in apposition to the suffix in ויבדילם (cf. v. 5); he separated them, *the troops, away* from his army. They went home full of wrath, and then afterwards invaded the southern kingdom (v. 13) destroying and plundering as they went.

Vv. 11, 12. *War with Edom* (cf. 2 Kings xiv. 7).—V. 11. "*Strengthened himself,* chap. xv. 8.—*The valley of salt;* to the south of the Dead Sea, cf. 1 Chr. xviii. 12.—The statement that ten thousand of the Edomitish prisoners were thrown down from the top of a rock is only found in the Chronicles; on the other hand the fact that Sela, the capital of Edom, was taken by the Jews at this time is only noticed in the Book of Kings.

In opposition to the conjecture, that the account contained in the Chronicles originated in the attempt to restore the illegible text of the Book of Kings (*Thenius*), it is sufficient to say that the change would be very great indeed, as the words employed in the text of the Chronicles, if we except the word סלע, do not correspond to those of the passage in Kings, either in their sound or in the number of their letters. Should it be said, however, that the passage might have been taken, not from the text of our Books of Kings, but possibly from the same source as the account in Kings, though after the text had become illegible, the one conjecture would only rest upon the other, without gaining any force in consequence. The war with the hateful Edomites cannot have been carried on without cruelty, and there is no reason to doubt that the historian may have found in the sources he employed some more minute particulars of the events connected with the war. Of course we must not lay too much stress upon the round number *ten thousand.*

V. 13. *The soldiers of the northern kingdom invade the country.* After the relative clause, the narrative is carried forward in the imperfect with *vav conseq.*, the subject being placed first for the sake of emphasis; and *the men belonging to the company* (mentioned in v. 10) . . . . *they invade*, &c., cf. Gen. xxii. 24. *The cities of Judah from Samaria to Beth-horon*, a singular description of the cities in the northern parts of the kingdom of Judah, which must be explained as meaning: *all the cities of Judah*, which stood in the line of march from Samaria to Beth-horon. Hence Samaria is mentioned as the starting-point of the invading army, not as the boundary line of the cities of Judah. On the site of Beth-horon, see 1 Chr. vii. 24. The attack upon the northern cities of Judah was probably made when Amaziah was absent with his army in Edom.

Vv. 14—16. *Amaziah introduces the Edomitish idolatry, and repulses with harsh words a prophet who blames him for doing so.* V. 15. cf. chap. xxxii. 13.—V. 16. The question, have we appointed thee a *counsellor* to the king, calls forth the appropriate reply: I know that God hath taken *counsel* to destroy thee, because thou hast done this (the worship of the Edomitish idols is referred to here) and hast not hearkened to my *counsel.*

Vv. 17—28. *Disastrous war with Joash, the king of the*

*northern kingdom, and conclusion.* Compare 2 Kings xiv. 8—20. (See the commentary on Kings, Vol. ii. p. 12—15).

## 10. Chap. xxvi.

### UZZIAH.

Vv. 1—4. (Compare 2 Kings xiv. 21—22, xv. 2, 3).—V. 1. *Uzziah* is the name always given to this king in the present chapter, and in the Books of the Prophets Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. In the Chronicles he is only once called Azariah, 1 Chr. iii. 12. In the second Book of Kings we find the name Uzziah in chap. xv. 13, 30, 32, 34, and Azariah in every other passage, *e.g.* chap. xiv. 21, xv. 1. It has been supposed that Azariah was his original name, and that the name Uzziah was either assumed when he ascended the throne (compare Jehoahaz and Ahaziah, 2 Chr. xxi. 17, and xxii. 1) or given to him by his soldiers after a prosperous war *(Thenius)*. But, as we find a descendant of Kohath, who is called both Uzziah and Azariah (1 Chr. vi. 9 and 21), and a descendant of Heman named Uzziel, and also Azarel (1 Chr. xxv. 4 and 18), it is more natural to suppose that the names were used interchangeably as having almost the same meaning.—It is expressly stated, that *the whole nation* took Uzziah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king, from which we are probably to infer, that there was a first-born son of Amaziah, whom they passed over when the choice was made.—V. 2. It is singular that the account of the fortification of the port of Eloth on the Red Sea, which Uzziah *restored* to the kingdom of Judah (chap. xxxiii. 13), is placed before the chronological notices in v. 3, not only here, but in the Book of Kings, where we regularly find the chronological accounts of the commencement and duration of the reigns of the different kings placed first. This position might have been chosen either on account of the importance attached to the conquest of Eloth, or from the desire of the historian to introduce Uzziah to his readers as the king, who was known to them as the conqueror of Eloth (הוּא בָנָה *he is* the king, *who built*). *Thenius* assumes, as an explanation, that the conquest of Eloth

occurred in the early part of his reign (this is certainly intimated in the clause "*after that the king slept with his fathers*"), and that it was associated with the murder of Amaziah and the choice of Uzziah as king. The possession of Eloth was of such importance to Uzziah, that he fortified the city. It could only be as a port that it was important, and hence it is probable that in his time voyages were made by Israelitish nerchants to the countries of the East, as in the time of Solomon.—V. 4. On the announcement that he did right according to the judgment of Jehovah, like his father Amaziah, see chap. xxv. 2. The estimate of Uzziah's character in v. 5 differs somewhat from that in 2 Kings, being restricted to the assertion that he sought Jehovah as long as Zechariah lived. By this limitation the historian explains the fact, that a king, who is described in vv. 16—21 as rashly encroaching upon the rights of the priests, was yet able to wage the most prosperous wars, and received the assistance of God in his undertakings. ויהי לדרש, the infinitive with *lamed* is here connected with the verb היה, to describe a continued action, in the same manner as the participle; cf. chap. xxxi. 21, (he did that which was right . . . seeking his God). When *Zechariah* is described as a prophet, in the words "*who understood the sight of God*" (cf. Dan. i. 17), we must understand the sight of God as denoting that intercourse with God, which was the condition of prophetic activity; still there is something striking in the expression he *understood the sight of God*, for the sight of God, which was granted to the prophets only in moments of the highest inspiration, cannot be regarded as the effect of human culture or activity. Moreover this expression is not used anywhere else as a description of a prophet. There arises therefore a suspicion as to the correctness of the reading. Some of the MSS. have a different reading, and that of the text is not adopted in the versions, or in the earlier writings of the Jews. The *Septuagint*, *Targum*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Talmud*, *R. Salomo*, *Jarchi*, *Kimchi*, and others, read המבין בְּיִרְאַת האלהים, *who was a teacher in the fear of God*. In some of the MSS. we find ביראות and ביראֹת, cf. *de Rossi* var. lect. The Zechariah mentioned here is not known to us any further; we may therefore conclude that he was a celebrated prophet, who stood to Uzziah in the relation of a counsellor and teacher.

Vv. 6—15. *Prosperous wars, buildings and warlike power of Uzziah.*—V. 6. *Jabneh,* which is here mentioned in connection with Gath and Ashdod as a city of the Philistines, was probably the same place as the Jabneel spoken of in Josh. xv. 11, as a city in the province of Judah; after the time of the Maccabees it is frequently mentioned under the name of Jamnia. *In Ashdod; i.e.,* in the district of Ashdod *and in the other districts of the Philistines.*—V. 7. The place called *Gur-baal* occurs nowhere else; it is rendered in the Septuagint ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας, probably because the translators were thinking of Sela, the capital of the Edomites; according to the Targum it was the well known city of Gerar.—V. 8. Instead of "the Ammonites," the *Septuagint* has οἱ Μιναῖοι, but there is no reason to question the correctness of our reading, as there are other proofs that the power of Uzziah extended over the countries to the east of the Jordan, cf. v. 10. "*To the entering in*" (Judg. iii. 3); *his name reached as far as the boundary of Egypt;* this does not mean that his fame had spread as far as this, but that his kingdom touched the Egyptian frontier. The Hiphil החזיק is used here, as in Dan. xi. 7, 32, with the meaning to exercise power, to be victorious.—V. 9. *The corner gate,* (cf. chap. xxv. 23) probably at the north-west corner of the city; the *valley-gate,* on the western side, where the Joppa-gate now stands (cf. *Thenius,* die Stadt § 4). המקצוע, *the springing corner,* must be looked for, according to Nehem. iii. 19, 20 and 24, 25, on the eastern side of Zion (see *Thenius* § 5), and refers to a curve in the city wall. The tower at this point commanded the horse-gate, and thus defended Zion and the temple-hill also against an attack from the south-east. ויחזקם *and he put the towers in a state of defence,* v. 15, cf. chap. xi. 11.—V. 10. He built *towers in the desert,* in the district to the south-east of Jerusalem, on the west of the Dead Sea. The towers in this district, which was adapted for grazing, were intended to protect the cattle. *For he had many herds* in the desert just referred to (as the previous clause evidently implies), and *in the lowlands* between the mountains of Judah and the Mediterranean Sea (1 Chr. xxvii. 28), *and in the plain* on the other side of the Jordan in the province of Reuben (Deut. iv. 43; Josh. xx. 8; Jer. xlviii. 21). As the situation of *the plain* is not more minutely described, we can only suppose it to have

been the district on the east of the Jordan, which is called pre-eminently *the* plain. It is evident from Is. xvi. 1 that at this time the kings of the southern kingdom ruled over the countries to the east of the Jordan (cf. 1 Chr. v. 17). By the *Carmel*, as distinguished from the hills, on which the vineyards were, we must understand the local districts adapted for agriculture, cf. Is. xxix. 17; Jer. ii. 7 (cf. 1 Chr. xxvii. 25—31).—V. 11. לגדוד *in crowds*, in organised masses. The *numbering* was carried out by two officers who were skilled in writing and in the preparation of lists; these officers were placed under (על יד) Hananiah, who was one of the king's supreme officers.—V. 12. *The number of the heads of the fathers'-houses*, the number of the *military heroes was two thousand six hundred;* hence the army was divided into fathers'-houses, so that each father's house formed a distinct body. —The heads of the fathers'-houses are distinguished from the rest of the men as military heroes.—V. 13. בכח חיל, not *with the power of an army*, but *with mighty power*, the notion of power being greatly strengthened by the addition of the word *chail;* the same gradation is expressed in Zech. iv. 6 by the juxtaposition of the two words. *To help;* the verb with *lamed* is also met with in chap. xix. 2.—V. 14. *For them;* namely *for the whole army*. This is afterwards added to render it more emphatic. The whole army was thoroughly equipped. Shields, lances, helmets, and coats of mail were provided for the heavy armed troops, bows and stones for slings for the light armed. The *lamed* before אבני is a sign of the accusative, and is attached to the noun on account of its distance from the verb. The stones for slinging are certainly mentioned to show the completeness of the equipment, but the *lamed* does not mean *even to*, or *and even* the stones for slinging. —V. 15. חשבנות, with the dagesh in the שׁ, and therefore derived from a singular חִשָּׁבֹן (חֶשְׁבּוֹן in Eccl. vii. 25, 27 has a different meaning), according to the explanatory clause the *cunning work of an artificer*, and according to the description given here *cleverly constructed machines for slinging*. The subject to the verb הפליא is not God, as in Ps. xxxi. 22, but Uzziah, *he was helped in a marvellous manner so that he became strong.*

Vv. 16—21. *At the very moment, in which the king is about to usurp the priestly rights, notwithstanding the opposition of the priests, the leprosy shows itself in his forehead.* In 2 Kings xv. 5 it is

merely stated that God smote the king, and he was a leper till the day of his death. *Josephus* (Ant. 9. 10. 4) carries out the account still further, and states that the earthquake, which is mentioned in Amos i. 1 as occurring in the time of Uzziah, happened at the very moment when Uzziah resisted the priests, and also that the leprosy was caused by a ray of the sun which came through a crack in the roof of the temple and fell upon Uzziah's face.—V. 16. The word כחזקתו connects this account with the foregoing one, which closes with the same verb in v. 15. *His heart was so proud that he did wickedly ;* cf. chap. xxvii. 2. He went into the large hall of the temple to offer a burnt-offering upon the golden altar, contrary to the law contained in Num. xviii. 1—7. *Thenius* is of opinion that Uzziah wanted to restore the high-priesthood exercised by David and Solomon; *Ewald* (Alterthümer p. 277) also expresses the same opinion. According to our view, which we have not room to defend, David and Solomon certainly took the lead in religious festivals on special occasions, but did not discharge those official duties, which, according to the precepts of the law, belonged to the priests alone (cf. Hitzig Psalmen ii. p. 175).—V. 17. *Azariah the priest* is expressly described in v. 20 as the high priest at that time; but in the list of high priests 1 Chr. v. 27—41 (in which Amariah, the contemporary of King Jehoshaphat is mentioned, so as to furnish a chronological starting-point) we find no Azariah who could have lived in the time of Uzziah. *Valiant men;* so called because they were courageous enough to oppose the king.—V. 18. *And it does not redound to thine honour before Jehovah Elohim*; לא, where we generally find אין, appears to have been chosen on account of the לא לך, which immediately precedes it before the infinitive with *lamed* (*thou durst not burn incense !*)—V. 19. Beside the altar of incense; the words "*from beside*" are used because we are to imagine the king and the priests standing before the altar.—V. 21. *In the infirmary* (Krankenhaus), see *Thenius* on 2 Kings xv. 5; compare the law in Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2. The reason assigned here, "*for he was shut out from the house of Jehovah,*" is not given in 2 Kings; it must mean that, because he was declared unclean and durst not come into the temple, he was obliged to withdraw from intercourse with others, and to live in the infirmary. During the illness of the

king, Jotham was set over the king's house, *i.e.* he was prime minister, and in this capacity he judged the people of the land as ruler on behalf of the king.

Vv. 22, 23. *Conclusion;* compare 2 Kings xv. 6, 7. *The earlier and later;* chap. xxv. 26; 1 Chr. xxix. 29.—V. 23. Instead of "*in the city of David,*" which we find in 2 Kings, we have here the words, "*in the burial ground belonging to the kings, for they said, he is a leper;*" he was buried, therefore, near the sepulchre of the kings *(by his fathers)*, as they durst not bury a king, who had died from leprosy, in the sepulchre itself for fear of polluting it.

## 11. Chap. xxvii.

### JOTHAM.

Vv. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xv. 32—35.—V. 1. *Jerushah,* his mother, was probably the daughter of the high priest Zadok mentioned in 1 Chr. v. 38.—V. 2. The exception, "*only he entered not into the temple of Jehovah,*" is wanting in 2 Kings, where there is also no notice of Uzziah's entering the temple; the further limitation, "*and the people still did wickedly,*" means the same as the passage in 2 Kings, "only the high places were not taken away," &c. The words, "*he built the upper gate of the house of Jehovah,*" are found in the brief extract in Kings, but the account of the other buildings we find only in the Chronicles. The *upper* gate of the temple is certainly the upper gate, which was situated towards the north (Ezek. ix. 2) and which, according to the representations in Ezek. viii., led into the upper or inner court. In Jer. xx. 2, it is called the upper gate of Benjamin, which is in the temple. It was called the *upper* gate, not to distinguish it from the other gates of the inner court, which were on the same level with it, but probably because it was situated towards the north, towards that part of the temple hill, which was the upper as compared with the southern portion. There is good reason to doubt, whether it was called the *upper* gate because it was the *chief,* as *Thenius* supposes, for we seek in vain for any adjective, which would express the antithesis to

עליון in this sense, and would be employed with reference to a gate or a building. *He built the gate;* these words are not to be understood as denoting the erection of a gate, which was not previously in existence, but the restoration and beautifying of an old gate. As it was situated towards the north, the holy quarter, and was the principal entrance, this may have led Jotham to think it necessary to embellish it with architectural ornaments. *And on the wall of the Aphel,* the southern slope of the temple-hill, *he built much,* feeling the same desire as his father (chap. xxvi. 9) to secure the city and the temple against attacks from the south and east. *In the wooded hills, i.e.* on the summits of the mountains of Judah, where fortified cities could not be built, he erected *castles* (chap. xvii. 12) and *towers.*

V. 5 seq. *Successful war with the Ammonites.*—V. 5. *They brought him* tribute *again both in the second and also in the third year.*—V. 6. *He fortified himself,* that is, according to v. 7, he secured his throne by other prosperous wars. *For he made his ways firm* (Prov. xxi. 29), he walked firmly and modestly *before Jehovah.*

Vv. 7—9. *Conclusion,* cf. 2 Kings xv. 36—38.—V. 8. The repetition of the chronological notices already given in v. 1 may possibly be explained on the assumption that the historian found them in one of the sources, which he employed, at the commencement of the history of Jotham, and in another at the end. In v. 37 of the Book of Kings, the position of which answers to that of the present verse, it is stated that in the time of Jotham the war between the allied kings, Rezin and Pekah, and the nation of Judah had already broken out.

## 12. Chap. XXVIII.

### AHAZ.

V. 1—4. Compare 2 Kings xvi. 1—4. See the commentary on Kings, Vol. ii. 34—40.

Vv. 5—16. *War with Rezin, king of Aram, and Pekah, king of the northern kingdom;* cf. 2 Kings xvi. 5, and Is. vii. 1. The attempt to determine the relation in which the different accounts

stand to one another, has led to various results. Expositors are not agreed as to whether the description in the Book of Kings and that in Isaiah relate to the campaign, of which we have an account in the Chronicles. Of those who answer this question in the negative some are of opinion, that the account in Kings and Isaiah refers to the first campaign, and that in the Chronicles to the second; others, on the contrary, regard the latter as a description of the first campaign, and the former of the second. A very complete list of the representatives of the different opinions is given by *Caspari* in his work über den syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg p. 28, 29. His own opinion is that the Book of Kings and the passage in Isaiah treat of the same campaign as the Chronicles. The order of events he supposes to have been the following: the allied kings invade Judah (2 Kings xvi. 5 a); a great battle is fought between Pekah and Ahaz to the north of Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxviii. 5); Rezin fights with Ahaz in Idumæa (2 Chr. xxviii. 5 a; this result is said to be obtained from a comparison of 2 Chr. v. a and 2 Kings xvi. 6 !); the Jews taken prisoners by the two kings, both during and after the engagements, and the plunder collected by them, are sent away to their capitals in charge of a division of the army (2 Chr. xxviii. 5, 8, 12); and with the remaining troops they make an ineffectual attempt to besiege Jerusalem (2 Kings xvi. 56). But if this were adopted as the order of events, we should have to assume that the following, to say the least, very complicated movements were made by the armies: first, that both armies advanced into Judah, then that a division took place and two battles were fought with divided forces, one to the north of Jerusalem, the other in Idumæa; and that after this the two armies reunited for the purpose of besieging Jerusalem. The following arrangement appears much more simple: it is probable that one or more battles were fought anterior to the siege of Jerusalem, and there is nothing to hinder us from assuming, that a reference is made to these battles in v. 5, and that Ahaz, who was defeated in them all, found it necessary to retreat to Jerusalem. When the royal conquerors approached Jerusalem to besiege it, Ahaz and his people looked forward to their approach with trembling, Is. vii. 2. But the allied kings were unable to take the city, and Rezin marched round the southern point of the Dead Sea into the land

of Edom, 2 Kings xvi. 6. (In 2 Kings xvi. 6 Rezin alone is named, but it does not follow from this, that Pekah had gone away from him with his army, since the historian might attribute to Rezin, as the leader of the enterprise, that which had really been effected by the joint exertions of Rezin and Pekah). It is true that if we may arrange the events in this order, the question is not therefore decided, whether they all occurred in the campaign of a single summer. As it is expressly stated in 2 Kings xv. 37, that the war with the allied kings broke out during Jotham's reign, it is a very natural conclusion that the whole war was not confined to one summer or one campaign. Even the elaborate researches of *Caspari* fail to prove, that all the notices *must* refer to the events of the same campaign.—V. 5. ויכו בו (cf. v. 17) they effected a defeat *in him*, *i.e.*, in his army; so also ממנו *from him*, *i.e.*, from his army.—V. 6. So great a loss as the death of 120,000 soldiers in one day could not have befallen the inhabitants of the southern kingdom from any other cause, than *because they had forsaken Jehovah the God of their fathers;* this is clearly stated in chap. xv. 2.—V. 7. Among those who fell was a *king's son*, probably an elder member of the royal house, as the sons of Ahaz were still very young and can hardly have taken part in the battle; *a prince of the house*, that is, not a prince of the house of God, chap. xxxi. 13, 1 Chr. ix. 11, but a superior officer of the royal house; and *a prime minister* (cf. Esther x. 3. 1 Sam. xxiii. 17); they were all three slain by Zikri a hero of the northern kingdom.—V. 8. *Of their brethren*; this term is emphatically applied to the inhabitants of the southern kingdom both here and in v. 11; the soldiers of the northern kingdom did not scruple to take the wives, sons, and daughters of *their brethren* captive.—V. 9. The prophet Oded, concerning whom we have no further information, went to meet the army, which was returning with the prisoners and the booty, as Azariah ben Oded, chap. xv. 2, went to meet Asa. *On account of the anger of Jehovah—towards Judah, Jehovah hath given them into your hand;* ye have not gained the victory by your own power, and therefore ye ought to have shown yourselves gentle towards those with whom Jehovah was angry; *but ye have slain among them in a rage, which reaches to heaven, i.e.* not in a rage without bounds, but in a rage which God will

not suffer to go unpunished, cf. Ezra ix. 6. The words of this verse remind us of Is. x. 6 seq.—V. 10. The accusative, *and now the sons of Judah and Jerusalem*, is placed before the verb for the sake of emphasis; *these*, your brethren, from whom Jehovah has withdrawn his aid for a short time, "*ye think to enslave*." In this spirited address the word אתם, which is placed first, points to the suffix in עמכם: *are there not, as regards you, yes among you, sins against Jehovah?*—V. 11. As the measure of their iniquity was filled by their taking the wives and others captive, so could the wrath of God, the fearful judgment which was suspended over them, only be averted by sending back the captives.—V. 12. The names of the four men are only mentioned here; according to v. 14 the princes at the head of the whole congregation *opposed* those who were coming from the army.—V. 13. אשמת יהוה, a crime which must excite the anger of Jehovah, see v. 10; *for in order that an offence of Jehovah* may come *upon us, ye think* (ye intend) *to add to our sins*, &c., *i.e.*, according to v. 10, to bring upon yourselves the further sin of making the captives your servants and maids.—V. 14. *The armed men; i.e.* those who were sent to bring the prisoners to Samaria. *The spoil;* chap. xiv. 13.—V. 15. By the *men, who were mentioned by name*, we need not understand the four men referred to just before (cf. chap. xxxi. 19; 1 Chr. xvi. 41). *From the plunder;* sc. which had been taken in Judah (v. 8). *They anointed them*, for they wished them to return home, not like the mourners mentioned in 2 Sam xiv. 2, but in a joyous procession. לכל כושל, an accusative of which *lamed* is the sign: *they conducted them upon asses*, not all of them, but only *every one who stumbled*, that is, who was weary. *Jericho the palm city* (see Judges iii. 16) was in the southern kingdom, and therefore when the prisoners reached this city they had come to *the side of their brethren.*—This account of the defeat of Ahaz and the release of the captive women and children rests, as the names show, upon precise historical reminiscences. The historian presents the occurrence in such a light, that the reader may see in it an example of the way in which, according to the will of God as made known by the prophet, the inhabitants of the northern kingdom were always bound to act; but that which happened in the time of Ahaz, was to occur again, as Is. xliii. 5, 6;

and lx. 3 sqq. and other similar passages show, on a much larger and more glorious scale at the time of the great redemption. We see at once from the words themselves with what pleasure the historian dwells upon this event. He describes it in his own way, and gives the substance of the addresses of Oded and the princes in his own words.—V. 16. The general expression "*at this time*" shows that the application for help was made during the war with Syria and Ephraim. *The kings;* in all the ancient versions have the singular. We regard the singular as the original reading. *Caspari* (p. 44) supposes that the plural was intentionally chosen by our historian, who regarded the Assyrian kingdom or empire as represented or displayed in a concrete form by the line of Assyrian kings.

Vv. 17—21. *Judah invaded by the Edomites and Philistines; oppressed by the Assyrians.*—V. 17. The invasion of Judah can hardly have been attempted by the Edomites, till after Rezin had delivered them from the power of Judah, to which they had again been subjected since the days of Uzziah, (cf. 2 Kings xvi. 6 where, instead of *Aram* and the *Aramaeans,* we should read *Edom* and the *Edomites*).—V. 18. *Gimzo,* according to *Robinson* now called *Jimsu,* a large village on the road from Lydda to Beth-horon.—V. 19. Ahaz is called here *King of Israel,* not because he acted as if he had been a king of the northern kingdom rather than the king of Judah, nor yet from irony, because his reign was the bitterest satire upon the name of "King of Israel, the people of God" *(Caspari);* but Israel is rather to be considered here, as in v. 27, chap. xii. 6, xxi. 2, &c., as a term applied, according to well-known usage, to that portion of the Israelitish people which dwelt in the southern kingdom. הפריע, used in Ex. v. 4 with the accusative of the object, here written with *beth* in the sense: "*he had acted in a licentious manner in Judah,*" not, he had made the people of Judah licentious.—V. 20. ויבא עליו, as the following words show, can only denote a coming in a hostile sense. ולא חזקו must be explained from Jer. xx. 7, and 1 Kings xvi. 22, as meaning: *and did not overcome him;* if the usual interpretation, "*and strengthened him not,*" or, "*did not assist him,*" were correct, the verb *chazak* would be construed here with the accusative in a sense which it cannot be shown to bear anywhere else.—V. 21. חלק according to the

earlier expositors *to divide*, with the meaning: he took one part from the temple and another from the king's house; but the expression "*he divided the temple*," could not be paraphrased in such a way as this. We agree with *Gesenius* and others, who regard the word as meaning *to plunder*, though this is the only passage in which it is so employed; compare the substantive חלק. There are other similar passages, in which the temple and the king's house are spoken of (*e.g.* chap. xii. 9, xvi. 2, and 1 Kings xvi. 8); in the passage before us the latter is called *the house of the king and the princes*, probably because the intention of the writer was to show, that Ahaz seized upon the valuables belonging to the superior officers and others, who lived in the king's palace, and gave them up to the king of Assyria. But in what relation does the account here given stand to that contained in the Second Book of Kings? According to the Book of Kings the circumstances were as follows:—Ahaz solicited help from king Tiglath-Pileser, sent him silver and gold, and Tiglath-Pileser assisted him by going to war with the king of Damascus. According to the accounts in the Chronicles Ahaz applied to the king of Assyria for help in the time of the Syrio-Ephraimitish war (v. 16), but the latter marched against Ahaz himself, pressed him sore, but did not overcome him, for though Ahaz had sent treasures to Tilgath-Pilneser, this did him no good, *i.e.* in spite of the treasures Tilgath-Pilneser attacked him (v. 20 seq.) The difference between the two accounts is this: according to both of them Ahaz applied to Tiglath-Pileser for help at the time of his war with the Syrians and the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, and also according to both he sent treasures to Tiglath-Pileser. But in 2 Kings the application is said to have been successful. Tiglath-Pileser actually rendered assistance by the conquest of Damascus; in the Chronicles, however, this is passed over in silence. This, in itself, is not at all surprising; but when it is further stated in the Chronicles, that "Tilgath-Pilneser attacked Ahaz, and, though the latter had sent him treasures, no help was afforded him," we have here a different fact communicated from that referred to in the Book of Kings. We may safely affirm, then, that the statement contained in this verse, to the effect that the sending of the treasures did no good to Ahaz, is made with the whole result in view; and

that the account in Kings may be brought into harmony with it in the following manner: though assistance was rendered to Ahaz for the moment by the conquest of Damascus, the negotiations with Tilgath-Pilneser secured him no real help, but brought upon him eventually calamity and disgrace. We cannot dismiss the definite statement contained in this verse, that the calamity consisted in the fact that Tilgath-Pilneser attacked Ahaz and sorely pressed him, with a simple reference to the rhetorical character of our narrative as *Caspari* (p. 70) does, when he says "the words are not to be taken in a strictly historical sense, but as rhetorical in their character; they contain a bitter irony; if the author had intended to say that Tilgath-Pilneser made a regular attack upon Ahaz, he would most likely have chosen a different expression." It is conceivable, that, after the king of Assyria had rendered the first assistance to Ahaz by the conquest of Damascus, he was induced to turn against him and attack him, and that he sent an army, possibly only a flying company of marauders into the southern kingdom, for the purpose of extorting tribute. It is true, there is no mention of this in the Book of Kings (for there is no ground for the opinion, which some have expressed, that there is a reference in 2 Kings xvi. 18 to the outbreak of hostilities between Tiglath-Pileser and Ahaz), but it does not necessarily follow that the account in the Chronicles is an arbitrary invention, for the author is just as likely to have taken the account of the attack made by Tiglath-Pileser upon the southern kingdom from a source with which we are unacquainted, as that of the invasion of the Philistines (the historical character of which is attested by Is. xiv. 28 sqq. and 2 Kings xviii. 8), or of the Edomites.

Vv. 22, 23. *Introduction of Syrian deities.* Compare 2 Kings xvi. 10—16, where Ahaz is said to have caused a new altar to be made in the place of the old brazen altar of burnt-offering, after the pattern of an altar, which he had seen in Damascus.— V. 22. בהצר, *at the time when he was distressed, i.e.* when *Tilgath-Pilneser* was oppressing him. *He, King Ahaz;* who distinguished himself above every other king by the wickedness he displayed. V. 23. *Who had smitten him;* not only according to the opinion of Ahaz (so as to mean *as if they had smitten him),* but the historian himself describes them as the most dangerous

enemies that Ahaz had. *All Israel;* the judgments which the Assyrians were commissioned by God to inflict upon Judah are regarded by the historian as peculiarly the effect of the idolatry of Ahaz.

Vv. 24, 25. *Destruction of the sacred vessels and spread of idolatrous worship.* Compare 2 Kings xvi. 17, 18, where we read that, on account of the king of Assyria, that is in order to procure his assistance, Ahaz took away the valuable works of art from the temple. In the passage before us the rest of the narrative is omitted, and these circumstances serve as the groundwork of a description of the hatred which Ahaz displayed to the temple of Jehovah and his preference for the rites of the heathen. —V. 24. *Ahaz collected together the vessels of the temple and broke them to pieces,* he gathered them together that he might destroy the whole of them at once; קִצֵּץ occurs in the Second Book of Kings also, where it is used with the meaning "*to break off,*" as the context shows. But here it refers to the vessels, which were already collected together, gathered in a heap, and therefore must have the more general signification: *to break in pieces. He shut the doors of the house of Jehovah;* in order, as we gather from chap. xxix. 3, 7, to put an end, by forcible means, to the worship of Jehovah in the temple, inasmuch as Ahaz *had erected altars* for heathen worship *in every corner of Jerusalem,* and therefore the temple worship was superfluous.

## 11. Chap. xxix.—xxxii.

### HEZEKIAH.

Chap. xxix. 1, 2. Compare 2 Kings xviii. 1—3.—V. 1. *Abijah;* in 2 Kings we find the very abbreviated form *Abi,* which most likely differed from the other, not merely in the spelling (as *Thenius* supposes), but in the pronunciation also.

Vv. 3—36. *Purification and dedication of the temple.* Compare the short account in 2 Kings xviii. 5 seq.—Vv. 3—17. *In the first sixteen days of the first new year, after Hezekiah ascended the throne, the priests and the Levites purified the temple.*—V. 3. It is evident from v. 17 compared with chap. xxx. 2, 3, that by *the*

*first month* we are to understand the month prescribed in the law for the offering of the paschal sacrifice; it must therefore have been Nisan, the first month of the sacred year. It is not said that this first month was the month in which Hezekiah began to reign, all that is stated is that in the first year of Hezekiah's reign, the commencement of which year must be reckoned from the first of Tisri, and on the first day of the sacred year, the temple was opened. *He opened the gates;* see chap. xxviii. 24. *And he strengthened them;* according to 2 Kings xviii. 16, Hezekiah had provided for the beautifying of the doors, and to this the indefinite expression, "*he strengthened them,*" will refer, as this expression could be used with reference to a new building, or the restoration of an old one.—V. 4. *The eastern open space* before the temple was the inner court; see Ezra x. 9.—V. 5. *Sanctify yourselves* (v. 15, chap. xxx. 15); that ye may set about the work of sanctifying the temple in a state of levitical purity. —Vv. 6, 7. *Our fathers;* this must mean Ahaz and his contemporaries, since the charge of entire apostasy from Jehovah, contained in these very general words, could only apply to the generation immediately preceding Hezekiah. *And they turned the back;* not literally so by looking towards the rising sun, like the twenty-five in Ezek. viii. 16, and turning their backs upon the temple and God, who was enthroned upon the ark, but in this sense: they despised the dwelling-place of Jehovah.—V. 7. *The doors of the porch* are the doors of the house of Jehovah (chap. xxviii. 24), which led from the open space in the porch to the larger space in the temple. When they were shut, the *lamps* in the larger room could not be lighted, and the *incense* could not be burned upon the golden altar. The words, "*the burnt sacrifices also have not been offered,*" are probably based upon the account in 2 Kings xvi. 14.—V. 8. On the first clause of the verse, see chap. xxiv. 18, xxxii. 25. *As ye see with your own eyes;* this refers to the calamities, which befel the people under Ahaz: viz., the wars with the Syrians, Ephraimites, Philistines, and Edomites, and the oppression on the part of the Assyrians; cf. chap. xxx. 7; Neh. ii. 17.—V. 9. cf. chap. xxviii. 6, 8.—V. 10. *Now I have it in my mind;* see 1 Chr. xxii. 7. The concluding clause occurs again in chap. xxx. 8.—V. 11. *My sons;* the king applies this term to the priests and Levites in his hearty appeal. The

Niphal נִשְׁלָךְ only occurs here, see Deut. x. 8.—Vv. 12, 13. Two Levites are named belonging to each of the three great Levitical families Gershon, Kohath, and Merari; two from the family of Elizaphan, who is mentioned in Ex. vi. 18, under the name of Elzaphan (the son of Uzziel, the son of Kohath), and in the time of Moses was the prince of the family of Kohath, Num. iii. 30; then two each from the descendants of Asaph (the family of Gershon), of Heman (the family of Kohath), and of Jeduthun (the family of Merari, cf. 1 Chr. vi. 29—32); in all fourteen. Of the names given here, Machath, Eden ben Joach and Jechuel or Jechiel (chap. xxxi. 13—15) occur again. Some of the names, *e.g.* Kish ben Abdi, Joach ben Zimma, have already been given in the genealogical list in 1 Chr. vi., and appear to have been the names of Levitical families, by which the head of the family may always have been known.—V. 15. The fourteen chiefs *gathered their brethren*, at whose head they stood. *At the command of God* (chap. xxx. 12, cf. 1 Chr. xxv. 5); in the manner prescribed by the law.—V. 16. They went *within into the house of Jehovah* or into the הֵיכַל יְהוָה; *i.e.* they went into the holy place, and possibly into the holiest of all; compare Ezek xli. 3, where לִפְנִימָה occurs with the meaning within, into the holiest of all. The priests alone were permitted by the law to go into the actual temple. In this case, whatever they found there, that was unclean (we must assume, notwithstanding the account in chap. xxviii. 24, that the historian was thinking here of the pollution of the inner part of the temple by the idolatry of Ahaz, cf. v. 18), they brought into the outer court, where the Levites took it from them to carry it beyond the boundary of the sanctuary. *Into the brook Kidron*, chap. xxx. 14; 2 Kings xxiii. 12.—V. 17. On the first day they commenced with the sanctification or purification of the courts, this was finished on the eighth day, and then they came *to the porch of Jehovah*, *i.e.* they were able to enter upon the work of purifying the actual building, which required eight days.—V. 18—30. *Consecration of the temple by the offering of burnt sacrifices*, cf. Ezra vi. 17, viii. 35.—V. 18. *Within;* into the king's palace. Here only *one* table of show bread is mentioned, cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 16.—V. 19. *Which Ahaz had cast away* (see 1 Chr. xxviii. 9) *during his reign;* by perverting them from their sacred use (it is expressly

stated in 2 Kings xvi. 14, that he removed the brazen altar out of its place). Hence in chap. xxviii. 24, the historian must have referred to other articles. Here he is speaking simply of those which had fallen into disuse. The *altar of Jehovah* is the altar of burnt-offering, cf. v. 21.—Vv. 20, 21. Early the next day Hezekiah went to the temple with the princes of the city (his wish to proceed with the expiation immediately after the purification prevented him from assembling the representatives of the whole community). The bullocks, rams, and lambs were to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings, the goats as sin-offerings; together they formed the sacrifices of purification and consecration.—V. 23. The imposition of hands, which took place in the case of burnt-offerings and thank-offerings also (Lev. i. 4, iii. 2), is here particularly noticed in connection with the sin-offerings, probably because confession of sin accompanied the imposition of the hands (cf. Lev. xvi. 21), which gave to this symbolical action peculiar importance in the case of the sin-offerings.—V. 24. ויחטאו, not ויזרקו as in v. 22, for the blood of the sin-offerings they brought as an atonement to the altar, the priests sprinkling the horns of the altar with a portion of the blood and then pouring the rest of the blood on the floor of the altar (Lev. iv. 30—34). *For all Israel*, *i.e.*, for all the Israelites in the southern and northern kingdom, *the king had commanded the burnt-offering*, *&c.*, for Hezekiah regarded the temple as the sanctuary of all the Israelites, and at a later period invited the northern tribes also to take part in the passover, chap. xxx. 1.—V. 25. Comp. 1 Chr. xv. 16. *The king's seer;* cf. 1 Chr. xxi. 9.—*According to the commandment of David*, *&c.* (and at the same time in obedience to a command of God) *for the command was through Jehovah* (or as it is afterwards added by way of explanation), *through his prophets;* it does not follow from this that David is represented as one of the prophets, for as a *man of God* (2 Chr. viii. 14) he was able to issue injunctions on behalf of God.—V. 26. *With the instruments of David;* see 1 Chr. xxiii. 5.—V. 27. *At the time when the burnt-offering began* (Num. xvii. 11), *the song of Jehovah* (1 Chr. xvi. 42, xxv. 7) *and the trumpets also began, and that according to the lead of* (or *together with*) *the instruments of David.* In the *Septuagint* the *Vav* is not expressed before על ידי; in the *Vulgate* and *Syriac* the passage is rendered very freely. The text would be less obscure if either the *Vav* or על

יחד was omitted, but we have no right to make any alteration. —V. 28. The word *song* is used here for all the singers; see *Hitzig* on Ezek. xxxiii. 32. *The trumpeters;* see 1 Chr. xv. 24.—V. 29. להעלות, here used without the accusative of the object, which may be omitted, as it is evident from v. 27 that it is to burnt-offerings that the passage refers.—V. 30. *The seer;* this title is applied to Asaph here, to Heman in 1 Chr. xxv. 5, and to Jeduthun in 2 Chr. xxxv. 15.—Vv. 31—36. In the newly consecrated temple numerous *thank-offerings, praise-offerings, and free-will burnt-offerings were presented at the request of the king.* V. 31. The king addresses the priests, who were newly consecrated by the sacrifice of the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, and who were therefore fitted to resume the duties of their office in connection with the offering of sacrifice (cf. Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 1 sqq.). The *thodoth* were also thank-offerings, but of a peculiar description; on the occasion of their presentation songs of praise were sung, probably according to some fixed plan (cf. Nehem. xii. 31—40; Lev. vii. 11—15, xxii. 29 seq.). *The assembly;* not assembled priests, but chiefly the princes (v. 20), and the rest of those who took part in the meeting.—V. 34. Compare chap. xxx. 3, 15, 24. The removal of the skin of the burnt-offering was to be the work, according to Lev. i. 6, of him who offered the sacrifice; but here the priests are referred to as having this work to do, and they were assisted on the present occasion by the Levites, simply because a sufficient number of them had not yet sanctified themselves. *Till the work was ended;* that is till the animals were flayed and the priests had sanctified themselves; cf. chap. xxxv. 11. *For the Levites had been more honourable with reference to their own sanctification than the priests,* they had shown greater alacrity than the priests, who may perhaps have had a greater share in the introduction of the idolatrous practices of Ahaz, and may, therefore, have been more reluctant to comply with the wishes of Hezekiah.—V. 35. Another thing which prevented the priests from finishing the flaying by themselves was that the actual service of the altar made too great a demand upon their time, for *there were burnt-offerings in abundance with the fat of the thank-offerings* (which might be regarded as a part of the burnt-offerings, seeing that it had to be burned by the priests upon the burnt-offerings, Lev. iii. 5, vi. 5), *and with the*

*drink-offerings, which belonged to the burnt-offerings* (Num. xv. 1—16). On the last clause of the verse see chap. viii. 16, xxxv. 10. *By the service of the house of Jehovah* we must understand the act of purification and consecration.—V. 36. The article before הכין takes the place of the relative, see 1 Chr. xxvi. 28: *that God had prepared the people, for the thing was done suddenly*, and yet the people took such interest in it! Cf. chap. xxx. 12.

Chap. xxx. *Celebration of the passover.*—V. 1—12. The king invites all the Israelites to take part in the festival.—V. 1. *To all Israel, and* (as the writer adds to prevent misunderstanding, cf. chap. xxv. 7) *also to Ephraim and Manasseh*, the two leading tribes of the northern kingdoms, which are mentioned by name not as single tribes, but to denote the entire body of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom (cf. v. 10), *he wrote letters.*—V. 2. *In the second month;* as it was lawful for individuals to celebrate the so-called minor passover on the 14th of the second month, if they were prevented from keeping it in the first month (Num. ix. 6—13), the celebration of the passover on this occasion was postponed till the 14th of the second month (v. 13) after the king, the princes, and the whole assembly had held a joint consultation, for (v. 3) *at that time* (this indefinite expression refers to the period mentioned in chap. xxix. 3, so that we may substitute "in the first month") they could not keep it, (1) because the priests had not sanctified themselves in sufficient numbers (למדי is composed of ל, מה and די, *to that which was enough*, see 1 Chr. xv. 13), (2) because the people had not assembled. This seems to imply that, although the purification of the temple was not completed till the sixteenth day of the first month (chap. xxix. 17), the passover would have been kept in the first month, though possibly not on the legal fourteenth day, if it had not been necessary to postpone it for the reasons given here.—V. 5. ויעמידו דבר, correctly rendered in the *Vulgate et decreverunt*, see Neh. x. 33. *To issue a proclamation*, cf. chap. xxxvi. 22. *For they had not kept it in a body, as it is written;* these words are sometimes supposed to mean: they had not kept it *for a long time* according to the precepts of the law (thus explained by early Jewish expositors, and among those of modern times by *De Wette*). But it may be objected to this explanation that

לרב is not used by itself to denote a number of days or of years. In our view it relates to the crowd of participators: all Israel was summoned, for they had not kept it *en masse*, in the assembly of the whole people, as the law required, cf. vv. 13, 24. Nothing is said respecting the length of time during which it had not been celebrated by them *as a body*, see on the other hand v. 26; 2 Kings xxiii. 22.—V. 6. *The runners* (v. 10), like those mentioned in Esther iii. 13, 15, viii. 14, are royal messengers; the soldiers of the king's body-guard (chap. xii. 10, 11) were employed in this capacity, as we learn from chap. xxiii. 1 sqq. *They went away with letters—and according to the king's command to say;* they were to add a verbal exhortation to the written invitation. *And he may return to the remnant which is left to you from the hand of the kings of Assyria;* according to this, certain *kings of Assyria* had carried some of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom into exile as early as the time of Hezekiah. There were none carried away in the time of Phul (2 Kings xv. 19); in the time of Tiglath-Pileser, however, there may have been (1 Chr. v. 26; 2 Kings xv. 29). The expedition of Shalmanezer, which occurred in the sixth year of Hezekiah, 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 9—12, cannot be intended here, if a strict chronological arrangement is to be preserved.—V. 7. On the last clause see chap. xxix. 8. –V. 8. *Be not stiff-necked* (cf. 2 Kings xvii. 14; Neh. ix. 16, 17). *Give the hand*, see 1 Chr. xxix. 24.—V. 9. *Your brethren and sons*, who are living in exile, will be *an object of compassion* (this expression also occurs in Neh. i. 11) *to those who led them away and for a return to this land.*—V. 10. *They laughed them to scorn*, the Hiphil only occurs in this passage.—V. 11. *Humbled themselves;* see chap. xii. 7.—V. 12. *In Judah was the hand of God that he gave them, &c.;* cf. chap. xxix. 36. *By the word of Jehovah*, chap. xxix. 15.—Vv. 13—22. *The festival.*—Vv. 13, 14. The Israelites, who were assembled to sacrifice the passover and to keep the Mazzoth-festival connected with it, removed the altars (of burnt-offering) and the altars of incense erected by Ahaz (chap. xxviii. 24), that they might purify and sanctify Jerusalem the city of the festivals before the passover was offered, and threw them into the brook Kedron (chap. xxix. 16). The *mikteroth* (altars for incense), the altars upon which the *ketoreth* was offered are only mentioned here by this name;

they had their place in the idolatrous worship by the side of the altars of burnt-offering as well as in the Israelitish ceremonial. —V. 15. נִכְלְמוּ; according to chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3, this means *they were ashamed*, and were driven by the feeling of shame to make haste and sanctify themselves for this festival. Although the Levites are also mentioned here, notwithstanding the fact that they are said to have been ready before this to sanctify themselves (chap. xxix. 34), the passage refers especially to the negligent priests.—V. 16. *In their place* (chap. xxxv. 10) *according to the order prescribed* (see 1 Chr. vi. 17); עָמְדָם in this sense only in the Chronicles, Nehemiah, and Daniel. *They sprinkled the blood* of the paschal lambs *from the hand of the Levites;* the latter handed it to them, but they only did this as an exception on the present occasion, for—(v. 17) since many in the assembly had not sanctified themselves, the Levites presided over the slaying of the paschal lambs *for every* one that was *unclean, to sanctify the lambs to Jehovah* (chap. ii. 3), whereas at other times the heads of the families slew the lambs, and the priests received the blood from them, as the passage before us shows, and sprinkled it on the altar. In 2 Chr. xxxv. 6 the Levites are said to have superintended the slaying of the paschal lambs in the same manner as on this occasion, without any special reason being assigned; cf. Ezra vi. 20.—Vv. 18, 19. Of the three tribes named in v. 11 only two are noticed here, besides Ephraim and Issachar, viz., Manasseh and Zebulon. For such of them as had not purified themselves (הִטֶּהָרוּ; the form in pause, in which the Kametz under the *tet* is changed into Seghol in consequence of the new Kametz which is introduced, see Ezra vi. 20) the Levites took charge of the slaying of the paschal lamb, for they also *ate the passover, otherwise than it was written* (another exceptional feature and one opposed to the law, Num. ix. 6, cf. *Josephus* b. j. 6. 9. 3) but this exception was allowed, *because Hezekiah had prayed for them in these words: may Jehovah the good* (that is, the kind and merciful) *forgive every one who has set his heart* (see chap. xii. 14) *to seek the God Jehovah the God of his fathers though not according to the purity of the sanctuary* (וְלֹא introduces a conditional clause, if it be not according to the purity of the sanctuary, even if he have not purified himself according to the law). We follow the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and the *Syriac*,

which contains a somewhat freer translation, and connect בְּעַד at the end of v. 18 directly with v. 19; it stands here before a relative clause without אֲשֶׁר, like אל in 1 Chr. xv. 12 (see the note on this passage). Moreover the freedom of mind displayed here is worthy of regard; in order that the principal end might be attained, viz., the participation of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom in this festival, no stress was laid upon a form prescribed by the law.—V. 20. *And God healed the people;* we must imagine the whole affair to have been the following: in consequence of their transgressions they had cause to fear disease and even death (Lev. xv. 31); Hezekiah prayed for the nation, which was on the point of being diseased, and might therefore be regarded as sick already, as Abraham had once prayed for Abimelech when sick (Gen. xx. 7, 17), and restoration immediately ensued. No doubt, רפא means to pardon in this as in other similar passages, but only in the sense of averting the punishment of transgressions, cf. Jer. iii. 22; 2 Chr. vii. 14.—V. 21. On every one of the seven days the Levites and priests praised Jehovah with the instruments of the "*praise to Jehovah,*" *i.e.*, in the usual manner and with the instruments which they generally employed in their songs of praise.—V. 22. דבר על *he spake encouraging words of praise to the Levites, who showed good knowledge with reference to Jehovah, i.e.*, who distinguished themselves by their playing and their acquaintance with sacred music. *And they ate;* not the priests and Levites only, but the whole assembly ate, for many thank-offerings were sacrificed, the flesh of which was for the most part eaten by those who sacrificed, and such as were invited to participate in the sacrificial meals. המועד *the festival*, here with the meaning the festal sacrifice; cf. *chag*, Ex. xxiii. 18; Ps. cxviii. 27. ומתודים, not *making confession of guilt* (for the reference in these verses is merely to the utterance of joy), *but approaching Jehovah with offerings of praise*, presenting *thodoth* (chap. xxix. 31) as well as the thank-offerings.—Vv. 23—27. *When Hezekiah and the princes presented the assembled congregation with rich gifts for farther sacrificial meals, it was decided that they should remain together for the next seven days, that they might celebrate a further festival, as a supplement to the joyous feast already kept.* Compare the fourteen days' festival described in chap. vii. 8 seq.; though on

that occasion the seven regular feast days were the last of the fourteen.—V. 23. Instead of שמחה many MSS. read בשמחה, as for example in 1 Chr. xxix. 22; but the former reading without the *beth* must be retained, for a dependent accusative is by no means rare in such a construction: they passed seven days *in gladness*.—V. 24. הרים, to *present* on condition that the animals should be offered in sacrifice (as a תרומה Ex. xxxv. 24; Num. xv. 19 sqq.); cf. chap. xxxv. 7 sqq. The last words, *and all the priests had sanctified themselves in a body*, refer back to chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3; there was therefore no longer any reason to fear that the strength of the priests would be insufficient to offer so extraordinary a number of sacrifices.—V. 25. Those who took part in the festival were, first, the whole assembly of Judah, and the priests and Levites; secondly, all who had come from the northern kingdom; thirdly, the strangers (proselytes), both those who had come from the northern kingdom and those who dwelt in Judah.—V. 26 כזאת, there had been nothing *of this kind* in Jerusalem; the meaning is, that the festival at the dedication of the temple in the time of Solomon was the only one that could be compared with this either as to the time of its duration, the sacrifices offered, the number of participants, or the joy with which it was attended.—V. 27. In some MSS. there is a *vav* conjunctive before הלוים, which has been adopted in the *Vulgate*, *Septuagint* (Alex.), and *Syriac* versions. It does not follow, however, that it originally formed part of the text, for it may have been inserted in these versions for the sake of clearness. As the two words stand side by side *ἀσυνδετῶς* on other occasions, we are not warranted in putting the *vav* into the text; compare *Hitzig* on Jeremiah xxxiii. 18, and in addition to the passages cited there, 2 Chr. xxiii. 18.—According to the account contained in chaps. xxix. and xxx. the improvement of the worship by the purification of the temple and its fresh consecration was entered upon at the very beginning of Hezekiah's reign, because the pious king was desirous of celebrating the first passover and the feast of unleavened bread connected with it in the newly consecrated temple. The purification, however, occupied so long a time, that the passover could not be kept on the day prescribed in the law; it was therefore necessary to postpone it till the following month, when it was celebrated in a large as-

sembly, the inhabitants of the northern kingdom taking part. It is *a priori* a probable thing, that Hezekiah set about the purification of the temple at the commencement of his reign, and nowhere, either in the Book of Kings or in that of Isaiah, do we find any statements at variance with the account given here, that it was undertaken in the first year of his reign. At the same time our historian must have found in his sources more precise details with regard both to the feast of dedication which was celebrated after the purification of the temple (chap. xxix. 20—36), and also to the feast of passover and of unleavened bread (chap. xxx.). This is apparent not only from the names mentioned in chap. xxix. 12—14, but still more evidently from the account of the postponement of the feasts of passover and unleavened bread till the second month, from the reference to the priests who delayed to purify themselves (chap. xxix. 34, xxx. 3, 24), and also from the statement that of those who took part in the feast, some who had come from the northern kingdom ate the passover without having purified themselves according to the law, and that the Levites undertook the slaying of their paschal lambs (chap. xxx. 17, 18). With regard especially to the celebration of the passover in the time of Hezekiah it is not very strange that it should be passed over in silence in the Book of Kings, for that book refers but very briefly in any case to the improvement of worship; but if it be indisputable that Hezekiah abolished the worship of idols (see especially 2 Kings xviii. 22), it must be assumed that the great spring-festival, the passover and unleavened bread, was celebrated in his time in a different way, that is, in a manner more in accordance with the law of Moses than it had been before; we say: *more so than before,* because we think it probable that even during the prevalence of idolatry there were certain festivals observed at the same times as those appointed in the law for the celebration of the great Jewish festivals. The account given in 2 Kings xxiii. 23 has been appealed to as altogether at variance with the statement in the Chronicles respecting the feast of the passover in the time of Hezekiah, and it has been said that apparently the narrative in Kings, which refers to the time of Josiah, has been applied in a somewhat altered shape to that of Hezekiah! In our opinion there is no discrepancy between the account in the Chronicles and that in the Book of

Kings, for 2 Kings xxiii. 22 evidently stands in the closest connexion with the preceding verse, and is to be interpreted thus: such a passover, as that kept in the time of Josiah, *i.e.* one conducted in all respects so completely in accordance with the precepts of the book of the covenant, had not been celebrated since the time of the Judges. According to the account before us the passover was celebrated in the time of Hezekiah with greater joy and on a larger scale, than any that had been held since the days of Solomon, but still, as it is expressly stated, neither at the legal time nor in a strictly legal way. We are warranted therefore in maintaining the historical basis of the present narrative, still we do not overlook the mode of treatment adopted by the historian, and the freedom with which he has worked up the historical material, especially in the section chap. xxx. 5—11, where the passages are very numerous in which we can detect the style and particular expressions, which are peculiar to the Chronicles. We read there, that the messengers of Hezekiah and his princes were sent to the inhabitants of *the whole* northern kingdom, who had been visited by grievous calamities, and that they called upon the remnant, which had been spared by the kings of Assyria, to turn to Jehovah; but the greater number laughed at this summons, and very few, principally members of the tribes inhabiting the most northerly districts, paid any regard to it at all. Is *Thenius* correct in saying, that, when the historian wrote that the special reason for the celebration of the passover was the calamity which had befallen Israel in consequence of the captivity (chap. xxx. 6 sqq.), he was carried away by his zeal, and forgot or did not wish to remember that the captivity had not taken place so early as the *first* year of Hezekiah? On the contrary, we believe that he did think of this, and wished to think of it. His intention was to represent the majority of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom, and especially those dwelling on Mount Ephraim, and in the city of Samaria as men, who refused to be warned by the calamity which had befallen them from the hand of the Assyrians, and which was even then before their eyes, namely the invasion of Pul, and the captivity into which the fathers and brethren had been carried by Tiglath Pileser (the inhabitants would therefore be called in the strictest sense a remnant saved from the hand of the Assyrian kings, chap.

xxx. 6). He also meant to show that they ridiculed the last earnest appeal of Hezekiah, and *therefore* brought upon themselves by their own crimes the greatest calamity of all, the conquest of Samaria, the destruction of the northern kingdom, and the captivity of the time of Shalmaneser. The first year of Hezekiah was the third year of Hosea, the last king of the northern kingdom. He is said in 2 Kings xvii. 2 to have been a better king than his predecessors, and therefore we may safely assume that he did not oppose the wish of Hezekiah, that all Israel should assemble in Jerusalem to keep the passover.

Chap. xxxi. 1. *Destruction of the bamoth and idolatrous altars in both the southern and northern kingdoms.* Cf. 2 Kings xviii. 4. Even before the celebration of the passover the idolatrous altars in Jerusalem had been destroyed (chap. xxx. 14); immediately after the festival all who had taken part in it set out to cleanse the whole land of the altars and images (*from all Judah and Benjamin, i.e.* from the southern kingdom; *in Ephraim and Manasseh,* that is in the northern kingdom). It was not till this had been accomplished that every one went to his own home. The purification was completely effected, because, as we may assume the historian to mean, the force of those who went forth inspired by the festival was such as to frustrate all the attempts of the contemptuous Israelites (chap. xxx. 10), whether King Hosea or any one else, to preserve idolatry.

Vv. 2—11. *Arrangements for properly conducting the worship of God, and for the maintenance of the priests and Levites.* —V. 2. *To every one, according to his service, of the priests and the Levites;* the dependence of ללוים ולכהנים upon the word איש, which stands at some distance off, is shown by the preposition *lamed. In the gates of the tents of Jehovah;* see 1 Chr. ix. 18, 19.—V. 3. *The king's contribution from his possession* (we may see from chap. xxxii. 27—29 of what the possession consisted) *was for the burnt-offerings,* and indeed for all the burnt-offerings, which had to be offered according to the words of the law of Moses, Num. xxviii. 3, 4, 9, 11, 19, sqq. In העלות the ל must be supplied from לעלות; as העלות has the article, לשבתות is made dependent by *lamed: and for the burnt-offerings of the Sabbaths, &c.*—V. 4. *He commanded the people, namely the inhabitants of Jerusalem* (the passage must be rendered thus,

not *the people and the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, for the contributions of those who did not dwell in Jerusalem are not mentioned till v. 6), *to give the contribution for the priests and Levites* (Neh. xiii. 10), *that they might hold fast by the law of Jehovah; i.e.* in order that they might discharge the duties imposed upon them, and be released by their incomes from the trouble of maintaining themselves by their own exertions, cf. Neh. xiii. 10 sqq.—V. 5. הדבר is the king's commandment in v. 4. *The first-fruits* were assigned to the priests, Num. xviii. 12, 13, *the tithes* to the whole of the tribe of Levi, vv. 20—24.—V. 6. *The sons of Israel* are the inhabitants of the northern kingdom; *the sons of Judah, who dwell in the cities of Judah*, are the inhabitants of the southern kingdom, with the exception of the inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem. To the tribe of Levi all the *kodashim* were given, *which had been consecrated to Jehovah*, Num. xviii. 8. These kodashim were sacred gifts, v. 19. In this chapter they are mentioned in v. 12 along with the tithes, but that differs from the present verse in which the tithe of the consecrated things is said to have been delivered. The Vulgate has copied the text as we have it; but the translators of the Septuagint appear to have read וְעֵז וְהַקֳּדָשִׁים, for in addition to the tithe of the oxen and sheep they mention also a tithe of the goats. ערמות ערמות, *they laid in heaps*, and even *in many heaps*, the fruits, which were offered as first-fruits and tithes.—V. 7. ליסוד with Dagesh in the *Samech* (cf. *Ewald* Lehrb. 245 a.); it also occurs without the Dagesh in Is. li. 16. In the third month, that is immediately after the end of the wheat-harvest, they began to lay the foundation of the heaps, *i.e.* to deposit the under layer, and in the seventh month, that is at the close of the fruit-time and vintage, they had finished. The summer-harvest festival was kept in the third month, and the feast of the ingathering of corn in the seventh.—V. 9. *Hezekiah questioned the priests and Levites concerning the heaps*; to ascertain whether the amount of first-fruits and tithes was sufficient for the maintenance of the priests and Levites.—V. 10. *Azariah the high priest of the house of Zadoc*, the prince of the house of God, v. 13, is possibly the Azariah mentioned in chap. xxvi. 17. He cannot be the high priest Azariah referred to in 1 Chr. v. 39, for the latter was a

son of Hilkiah, the high-priest in the time of Josiah; see chap. xxxiv. 9, 2 Kings xxii. 4. לביא for להביא, also found in Jer. xxxix. 7. The infinitives *to eat and to be satisfied, and to leave in abundance,* are used in a lively discourse for the first person plural. Moreover, in a spirited address the את before המון הזה does not appear strange, for *that which is left* means *we have left* this large quantity.—V. 11. This passage leaves it uncertain whether new rooms were built, or the old ones fitted up as stores for the corn and fruits.—V. 12. תרומה is the name applied here to the first-fruits. *They brought in . . with safety,* acting both carefully and honestly in the matter, chap. xix. 9. *Over them;* over the first-fruits, &c. *Shimei,* chap. xxix. 14.—V. 13. *Jehiel* and *Mahath* are also mentioned in chap. xxix. 14.—מיד *by the side,* in the same sense as על יד v. 15. במפקד must mean *according to the arrangement;* it occurs in 1 Chr. xix. 5, and Ezek. xliii. 21, with a different meaning.—V. 14. *The door-keeper to the east,* see 1 Chr. ix. 18. He was over the *freewill offerings of God, i.e.* over all that had been voluntarily offered to God (Deut. xii. 17), *to give the lifting of Jehovah* (that is the share, of the thank-offerings for example, which was actually the property of Jehovah, and had been handed over by him to the priests, Lev. vii. 14, 32, x. 14, 15; Num. v. 9), *and the most holy things,* the portion of the sin-offerings, &c., which had to be eaten by the priests in a holy place; see for example Lev. vi. 10, 22, vii. 6.—V. 15. *Eden,* chap. xxix. 12. The men, whose names are given here, were in the priests' cities with a trust, namely to distribute to their brethren in the divisions, who dwelt in the priests' cities and were unable to come to the temple on account of their youth or their age, their proper share of the free-will offerings. כגדול כקטן, not *as to the higher so also to the lower* (Rambach), but as to the old men, so also to the children.—V. 16. *Besides their list of males* (with the exception of those whose names were contained in the list) *from three years old and upwards,* namely the list *of all those who came into the house of Jehovah for the portion set out for them every day* (cf. Neh. xi. 23), *for their service in their offices according to their divisions.* The children were allowed to go into the temple if they were over three years of age, and could therefore receive and eat the portion allotted to them in the place of the sanctuary

as well as the priests who performed the service.—V. 17. The sign of the accusative ואת is used here to give prominence to the word upon which the emphasis falls (*Ewald*, Lehrb. p. 570): *as for the list of priests*, it was *according to fathers'-houses*, and for that *of the Levites, those from twenty years old and upwards were in their offices. From twenty years old*, see 1 Chr. xxiii. 24.—V. 18. After the parenthetical clauses in vv. 16 and 17, which contain more precise details, ולהתיחש may be regarded as a continuation of לתת in v. 16: the men were in the priests' cities also *to register their children, &c.* לכל־קהל is subordinate: their children, namely those of the whole assembly. קהל must mean the corporation of priests. They were obliged to keep a register of the children, &c., that the gifts allotted to them might be regularly distributed, *for according to their trust* (v. 12) *they occupied themselves with the distribution of the consecrated things;* התקדש is not used anywhere else in this sense, but there is nothing to hinder our giving this interpretation to the Hithpael.—V. 19. The priests also, *who lived in* the *suburban fields of their cities* (Lev. xxv. 34), *and indeed of each particular city* (בְּ as in the accounts of the census: including every particular city), *had their own servants, who are mentioned by name* (chap. xxviii. 15, just as the inhabitants of the priests' cities are said to have had such servants, v. 15), *to give the portions to every male among the priests and to every one who was registered among the Levites.* The third person perfect התיחש is placed after כל without an intervening relative, compare the similar combination in Gen. xxxix. 4.—Vv. 20—21. *Hezekiah did that which was good, &c., and in every work, which he began for the service of the house of God, and for the law and for the commandment seeking his God* (the infinitive with ל as in chap. xxvi. 5), *he acted with all his heart* ("with a perfect heart" in other places, *e.g.* chap. xix. 9), *and prospered.*

Chap. xxxii. 1—23. *Invasion of Sennacherib and destruction of the Assyrian army*, cf. 2 Kings xviii. 13—xix. 37; and Is. xxxvi. —xxxvii.—V. 1. Instead of the chronological statement in 2 Kings xviii. 13, we have here only the indefinite connecting formula: *after these things*, &c. והאמת, *and after this fidelity* (chap. xxxi. 20), which Hezekiah had shown in the restoration of the worship of God. *And he thought to conquer them for him-*

*self;* according to 2 Kings he succeeded in taking the fortified cities. Our historian does not mention this, or the event recorded in 2 Kings xviii. 14—16, in order that he may not weaken the narrative of the miraculous deliverance of the Jewish state during the reign of this pious king, by a description of the misfortunes which befel Hezekiah at the commencement of the Assyrian war.—Vv. 2—8. This account of the fortification of Jerusalem, and the preparations for resisting the Assyrians, is only given in the Chronicles. It is confirmed, however, by Is. xxii. 8—11.—V. 26 is a conditional clause: *his face being directed to war against Jerusalem.*—V. 3. *To hide the water of the fountains, which were outside the city;* by covering them over and drawing them off in subterraneous channels. *And they helped him;* by taking care (v. 4), that a sufficient number of labourers were procured for this difficult undertaking. *The brook that flowed through the midst of the land,* and which was formed by the overflowing of the water of the fountains, and therefore was necessarily dried up when the fountains were covered up and drawn off, was the brook Gihon; the *Septuagint* reading is "*in the midst of the city,*" but the reading of the text is perfectly appropriate; cf. v. 30, Jes. Sir. xlviii. 17; 2 Kings xx. 20, and *Thenius* (Stadt. § 9).—*The kings of Assyria,* the plural is used here because the thoughts of the speakers were directed not merely to the invasion of Sennacherib, but to all the future wars in which they might possibly be engaged with the Assyrians and their kings.—V. 5. ויתחזק must be explained, according to such passages as chap. xv. 8, xxiii. 1, as meaning: *He showed himself strong. He built up the wall that was broken down,* repairing the breaches, &c. (Neh. iv. 1), see Is. xxii. 9, 10. ויעל על־המגדלות; *Thenius* follows *Gesenius* and others, and renders this: *he caused to ascend* (that is, he raised the masonry) *upon the towers,* an explanation, which certainly gives a suitable meaning to the passage, but for which there is no good foundation in the words employed, for if it is necessary to supply an accusative to העלה *he brought up,* we may supply masonry, no doubt, but we may just as well supply machines for keeping off the enemy (chap. xxvi. 15) or any other object. As the words stand in the text they mean: *he ascended the towers and the outer wall outside them,* for the purpose of sur-

veying them, and making preparations for defence. There is ground, however, for questioning the correctness of the text, for the words ויעל על are not expressed at all in the *Septuagint*, and the translators of the *Vulgate* appear to have read ויעל עליה (this is the reading which *Ewald* defends); the *Syriac* and *Arabic* depart altogether from our text. It is possible that ויעל על may have arisen by mistake from וְעָלֶיהָ, and that the original reading was: *he built the whole wall—and upon it the towers, and upon them the other wall*, which ran round the lower city (see *Thenius* die Stadt § 3, 4). ויחזק as in chap. xi. 11. *Millo in the city of David*, see 1 Chr. xi. 8. On the last words see chap. xxvi. 14.—V. 6. *On the open space at the city gate;* which gate we are not told, see Neh. viii. 1, 16. *And he spoke encouraging words*, see chap. xxx. 22.—V. 7, 8. The first words resemble Deut. xxxi. 6 and similar passages. רב is not to be referred without further definition to God, and interpreted as meaning: *with us is a greater and more powerful God than with him.* On the contrary, as v. 8 clearly shows, the passage must be rendered thus: with us there is more, something greater than with him, for with him there is only human power, with us there is God, &c. *And to fight in our wars;* מלחמות in this passage is a subordinate accusative, see 1 Sam. viii. 20, xviii. 17. —V. 9. Brief summary of the accounts, which are narrated more fully in 2 Kings xviii. 17—19 a. *As he himself was near Lachish, and his whole kingdom with him;* ממשלתו not only *his princes* (*Gesenius* in thes.) but the whole force of his kingdom, see the more definite expression Jer. xxxiv. 1. On the situation of *Lachish* see chap. xxv. 27.—Vv. 10—15. Brief summary in the accounts in 2 Kings xviii. 19 b.—35.—V. 10. וישבים במצור׳ a continuation of the question: "*wherein do ye trust?*" meaning why *do ye sit in the vice* (according to Jer. x. 17) *in Jerusalem?*—V. 11. *To deliver you up to die by hunger and thirst;* in writing these words the historian had probably 2 Kings xviii. 27 in his mind.—V. 12. Compare 2 Kings xviii. 22, where, however, even more emphatically than in this passage, God is described as he whose *bamoth* and altars Hezekiah had taken away. The words of Kings are, "*is it not this God, whose bamoth,*" &c.; here on the other hand we have: "is it not this Hezekiah, *who*

*has taken away his* bamoth, &c., namely those of the God mentioned in the previous verse. By *one altar* (2 Kings : *this altar)* a more distinct reference is made to the exclusive validity of the worship in the temple, which had once more been established by Hezekiah.—Vv. 13, 14. See 2 Kings xviii. 35. The original words are found in Is. x. 8—11, but Is. xxxvi. 20, and more particularly Is. xxxvii. 11—13, appear to have floated before the mind of the historian. *Who is there among all the Gods of these nations, who . . . . . who was powerful enough to deliver . . . . . that your God should be strong enough to deliver you out of my hand?* in other words, as the Gods of the more powerful heathen nations are stronger than your God, and yet could not deliver, so will your God, even if he wish to do so (and according to v. 12 this is by no means to be expected) not be able to deliver you.—V. 15. The first clause resembles 2 Kings xviii. 29, 32. In addition to reviling the God of Israel (cf. Is. x. 14, 15) he adds still farther: for there was no God of any nation and kingdom (1 Kings xviii. 10) who was able to rescue his people, . . . *and that your God will not save you out of my hand!* (we may easily supply: "is quite certain)." In this way we must explain אף כי, which introduces the antithesis to an earlier negative clause; see on the other hand Ezek. xv. 5.—V. 16. *His servants;* see v. 9.—V. 17. Compare 2 Kings xix. 14 and 10—13; Is. xxxvii. 10—14.—Vv. 18, 19. After the parenthetical remark in v. 17 the acts of the servants of Sennacherib are farther described; compare 2 Kings xviii. 26—35; Is. xxxvi. 11--22. The historian expressly states why the servants of the Assyrian king spoke loud and in the Jewish tongue, intending by this explanation to indicate to his readers the subject of the address, which he did not think it necessary to communicate in full. *To affright them;* the infinitive of the Pual occurs in Neh. vi. 19 also (cf. v. ix. 14). *As against the Gods of the nations of the earth, the work of men's hands;* see 2 Kings xix. 18.—V. 20. Compare 2 Kings xix. 15—34 and Is. xxxvii. על זאת *with reference to this, i.e.,* with reference to the contempt shown to the God of Israel, to which reference is so emphatically made in the prayer of Hezekiah (2 Kings xix. 15 sqq.) and in the words of Isaiah v. 22 sqq.—V. 21. Cf. 2 Kings xix. 35 sqq.; Is. xxxvii. 36 sqq. The words, "*with all*

*the brave warriors*," refer to the common soldiers in distinction from the *princes and leaders* (see for example chap. xvii. 14); hence the entire number of the dead is not given here, on the contrary it is expressly stated that even the princes and leaders were not spared. The deviation from the account in Kings is therefore very small. מִיצִיאֵי (Keri) compounded of מן and the plural of יָצִיא, *some of those who proceeded from his bosom*, in other words some of his sons. יָצִיא is a Kal participle in the intransitive form for יֹצֵא. The Kethib can hardly be satisfactorily explained as it stands in the text; it was probably written originally מִיָּצְאוּ, some of those who had proceeded, מן being attached to the perfect without an intervening relative, cf. chap. i. 4; 1 Chr. xv. 12.

V. 22. After the word *all*, some MSS. read איביו *his enemies*. The *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* follow our text; in the *Syriac* and *Arabic* (from the hand of all round about) the word וינהלם is omitted. This word is quite unintelligible, for if we should render it, God *led* Hezekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem carefully as a shepherd leads his flock, מסביב would be unsuitable. The reading adopted in the *Septuagint* and *Vulgate* is וַיָּנַח לָהֶם, and this we must accept as the original text, not only because it could easily have given rise to our present reading, but because the same expression is so frequently employed by our historian (*e.g.* chap. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 30; cf. 1 Chr. xxii. 18). We observe further that the verse before us gives merely a general outline of the account contained in 2 Kings xviii. 7, 8.—V. 23. Among the *many*, who brought presents to Hezekiah, were the Babylonian ambassadors (2 Kings xx. 12), and therefore we are not warranted in concluding that *the many, who brought gifts to Jehovah at Jerusalem*, were all of them Israelites, especially as the verse concludes with a reference to the honour in which Hezekiah was held by *all the heathen* after his rescue from the Assyrians. Heathen inhabitants of Palestine (*e.g.* the Philistines, who were delivered from a powerful enemy by the destruction of the Assyrian army), might be induced to send gifts to the God, who was worshipped in Jerusalem, the city that had been so miraculously spared. On the presents, which were brought to Hezekiah, see chap. xvii. 10 and xx. 29.

V. 24. *Hezekiah's sickness.* Compare 2 Kings xx. 1—11, and Isaiah 38. (See the commentary on Kings).

Vv. 25, 26. *Pride of Hezekiah.* Compare 2 Kings xx. 12—19, and Is. xxxix.—V. 25. *Hezekiah did not render* to God *according to the benefit done to him, for,* though he promised in his sickness to walk humbly (Is. xxxviii. 15), *his heart became proud* after he recovered. His pride showed itself in the fact, that he displayed all his treasures to the Babylonian ambassadors, not merely from vanity, but, as *Thenius* observes, that they might see the extent of his resources, and be convinced of the worth of an alliance with him. "*And there was wrath upon him,*" which necessarily fell upon his people also on account of the close connection between the king and the nation (compare the wrath which fell upon Israel when David numbered the people, 1 Chr. xxvii. 24; 2 Chr. xix. 10); but the next verse appears to show that the inhabitants of Jerusalem also rendered themselves guilty by their proud behaviour.—V. 26. The words "*in the days of Hezekiah*" call to mind the expression used by Hezekiah in 2 Kings xx. 19. The fact that the wrath of God was excited is evident from the word of God by Micah: Zion shall be ploughed as a field, &c., but his wrath did not break out, because Hezekiah feared Jehovah and prayed to him, or, as it is expressed here, humbled himself.

Vv. 27—31. *Hezekiah's wealth and prosperity.*—V. 27. cf. 2 Kings xx. 13 and Is. xxxix. 2.—V. 28. Like David and Uzziah (1 Chr. xxvii. 25 sqq. and 2 Chr. xxvi. 10) Hezekiah had large stores of corn, &c., and numerous herds. אֻרָוֹת, and at the end of the verse אֲוֵרוֹת, apparently in the same sense: *stalls for all kinds of cattle and herds for the stalls*; the first form occurs in chap. ix. 25 (with but a slight variation) and 1 Kings v. 6; the latter we do not find anywhere else, nor can we say in what relation it stands to the former, for whether it arose from a transposition of the letters, or is to be referred to a somewhat different root, and therefore has a slightly different meaning (*e.g.*, hurdles for sheep) we cannot tell.—V. 29. עָרִים; in this connection, "*towers for the watchmen of the flocks*" (cf. chap. xxvi. 10); according to 2 Kings xvii. 9 the term עִיר, which denoted any enclosure, might also be applied to them.—V. 30. *And this*

*same Hezekiah shut up*, &c.; reference is emphatically made here, as in 2 Kings xx. 20, at the close of the history of Hezekiah, to the aqueduct which he made, and which had already been mentioned in vv. 3, 4. *He conducted the water underneath* (below the ground) *to the west of the city of David;* see chap. xxxiii. 14. *And Hezekiah prospered;* chap. xxxi. 21; 1 Chr. xxix. 23.—V. 31. The account of his conduct towards the Babylonian ambassadors (vv. 25, 26) appears to be at variance with the statement that he was prosperous *in all that he did*, for did they not come to Jerusalem to his hurt? The question is answered thus in the verse before us: *and accordingly God left him to the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon—to prove him, and find out his whole heart, i.e.*, God permitted the ambassadors for a moment to take possession as it were of Hezekiah, and draw away his heart from God; he did this, however, not for the purpose of bringing him into misfortune, but to put him to the test, and see whether he was ready to confess his fault and humble himself. וכן, not in an antithetical sense, *and yet*, but rather to show the connection with the previous sentence, and to point out one of the results. The *melizim* were the ambassadors themselves, who are called quite indefinitely ambassadors, Babylonian princes, because all that was required was to describe them as Babylonian. *Thenius* is of opinion that the persons referred to were attachés of the ambassadors (in other words of the princes of Babylon), who made enquiries on their own account concerning the sign (v. 24); but the meaning of this verse evidently is, that the ambassadors of the astronomical Chaldaeans came to Jerusalem, to make enquiries as to the miraculous sign, which had occurred in *the land* of Palestine, and had excited the notice of the Babylonians.

Vv. 32, 33. *His goodness*, which is also mentioned in the case of Josiah (chap. xxxv. 26) means his pious deeds, see Neh. xiii. 14.—The statement that Hezekiah was not buried in the family sepulchre of the descendants of David, but *by the road that led to* the sepulchre, we only meet with here. *Thenius* (on 2 Kings xx. 21) conjectures that there was no room for Hezekiah in the family sepulchre, and therefore a private tomb was constructed for him, and for the kings that succeeded him.—*And*

*showed him honour at his death*, &c.; these words suggest particularly the burning of many spices, compare chap. xvi. 14 and xxi. 19.

## 14. Chap. xxxiii. 1—20.

### MANASSEH.

Vv. 1—10. *His idolatry;* compare 2 Kings xxi. 1—16.—(See the commentary on Kings.)

V. 11—13. *His imprisonment in Babylon, conversion and return.* V. 11. בחוחים does not mean they took Manasseh, who was hidden *among the thorns* (1 Sam. xiii. 6), nor they took him *with hooks* (in other words, by stratagem), and certainly not "they took him at a place called *Chochim*, which is not met with anywhere else" *(Thenius)*; but לכד ב has nearly the same meaning as אסר ב which follows, and חוחים means *fetters*, the explanation adopted in the Septuagint, *Vulgate*, and *Targum*, and by Jewish expositors.—V. 13. The prayer which Manasseh offered in his distress is said, in vv. 18—19, to have been recorded both in the history of the kings of Israel, and also in that of the prophet Hozai, where there was no doubt a full account of Manasseh's captivity. Whether the prayer of Manasseh, contained in the Septuagint, was taken from these works, we cannot tell. The *Targum* and *Georgius Syncellus* contain miraculous accounts of the deliverance of the king, which were probably copied from an apocryphal work composed at a later time. We have no further particulars in the Old Testament respecting his escape; but this is not to be wondered at, as the Books of Kings merely contains a very short notice of the whole of the period embraced by the reigns of Manasseh and Ammon. We agree with *Ewald*, *Thenius*, *Keil*, and others, in their opinion that the release of Manasseh took place in the reign of the Assyrian king Esarhaddon. Manasseh may have been taken to Babylon by the Assyrians; for, according to an account of *Abydenus* quoted in *Eusebius*, Sennacherib had again succeeded in subjugating the Babylonians.

Vv. 14—17. *His plans for securing the safety of his kingdom and restoring the worship of God.*—V. 14. *He built an outer wall from the city of David westwards* (the direction may have been given thus, on account of the wall stretching first of all towards the north-west, and from the north-west corner of the city of David) *to Gihon in the valley, and thence to the fish-gate* (at the north-eastern corner of the lower or new city), *and he enclosed the Opel* (carrying the wall from the north-east corner towards the south and then round the Opel, which Uzziah and Jotham had already done something to fortify), *and he made the wall very high.* It is not stated that this outer wall was begun by him (Hezekiah had already done something towards the erection of a second or outer wall, and Uzziah and Jotham towards the fortification of the Opel), but that he had it raised.—V. 15. Compare vv. 3—7; the last clause must be explained in accordance with chap. xxix. 16 and xxx. 14.—V. 16. In many MSS. and editions the Kethib is ויבן, in other MSS. and a large number of the ancient editions the Keri is ויבן and the Kethib ויכן; the latter is confirmed by the Vulgate and Syriac. Probably all that the word implies is that Manasseh repaired the ancient altar by building it afresh. *Ewald* infers from this passage that Manasseh removed the altar of Jehovah from the forecourt and subsequently restored it.—V. 17. The intention of this verse is to show that Manasseh removed all the idolatrous altars, but that the unity of the worship of God was not maintained in his days so perfectly as in the time of Hezekiah (chap. xxxii. 12), since the people sacrificed to Jehovah on the *bamoth* as well, in the same manner as in the time of Jehoshaphat (chap. xx. 33). The statements in vv. 15—17, which are not found in the Book of Kings, are closely connected with the account of the release of Manasseh, they ascribe to Manasseh, after his conversion, a share in the restoration of the purer worship of God, which is ascribed in Kings to Josiah alone.

Vv. 18—20. *Conclusion.*—V. 18. *Manasseh's prayer*; see v. 13. —V. 19. *And his suffering himself to be intreated of him,* in other words, the manner in which God hearkened to him, v. 13.— V. 20. Instead of ביתו we must follow the *Sept.* and 2 Kings, and read בגן ביתו; in 2 Kings the garden of his house is also

called the garden of Uzzah. The *Syriac* has "*in his house in the garden of the treasure*," but very little importance is to be attached to this. *Thenius* assumes that the burial-place of Manasseh was in the hill of the Opel which was opposite to Mount Zion.

## 15. Chap. xxxiii. 21—25.

### AMON.

Compare 2 Kings xxi. 19—26. (See the commentary on Kings.)

## 16. Chap. xxxiv. and xxxv.

### JOSIAH.

Chap. xxxiv. 1—7. *His piety; extermination of idolatry.*—Vv. 1, 2. Compare 2 Kings xxii. 1, 2. Josiah is the only king of whom it is said that *he turned aside neither to the right hand nor to the left.*—Vv. 3—7. In the eighth year of his reign Josiah began to seek God, and in the twelfth year he began to purify Judah and Jerusalem and to exterminate idolatry. These chronological notices appear to differ from the account in the Book of Kings, where the extermination of idolatry is said to have taken place after the events which occurred in the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign, and in the same year as those events; for the notice respecting the abolition of idolatry, in 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20, refers to the same facts as are assigned by the verses before us to the twelfth year of Josiah's reign (compare v. 4 with 2 Kings xxiii. 4—6, v. 5 with 2 Kings xxiii. 7—14, vv. 6, 7, with 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20). If it had been expressly stated in the Chronicles, that idolatry was rooted out in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, or that it was thoroughly exterminated before his eighteenth year, the chronological order of events, as described in the Chronicles, would not be the same as that given in the full and regular account contained in the Book of Kings. But in

that case the Chronicles would also be at variance with themselves, for in chap. xxxiv. 33 the complete extermination of idolatry is assigned to the same period as in the Book of Kings. But all that we find stated in v. 3 is that *Josiah began to purify Judah and Jerusalem in the twelfth year of his reign*, and this chronological notice may have induced our historian to proceed at once to complete his account of the purification of the land from idols. Subsequently, at chap. xxxiv. 33, very few words suffice to call attention to the time when the purification was finished. On the other hand, in the Book of Kings, the cleansing of the temple, which took place before the passover, afforded an opportunity for giving a general account of the measures adopted by Josiah for the extermination of idolatry, and there is nothing to hinder our assuming that the comprehensive description contained in 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20, includes such events as occurred before the eighteenth year of his reign. A strictly chronological account of the order in which the events occurred is not to be found either in the Book of Chronicles or in that of Kings; but from the information contained in the Chronicles it is evident that the abolition of idolatry commenced in the twelfth year of Josiah's reign, and was completed in the eighteenth. In other respects the Book of Kings contains the more complete history of the two, but so far as the chronology is concerned it must be filled up from the Chronicles.—V. 4. cf. chap. xxxi. 1. *The pillars, which stood upon the top of them;* chap. xiv. 4. *He crushed them to powder;* v. 7, chap. xv. 16; 2 Kings xxiii. 6. הזבחים is here connected immediately with הַקְּבָרִים, so that the graves themselves are regarded as guilty of the crimes of those who were lying in them; we must render it rather freely: *on the graves of those who brought sacrifices to them.*—V. 5. *And bones of the priests*, which he caused to be taken out of the graves, *he bnrned upon their altars*, thus punishing the idolatrous priests after their death by removing them from their graves and at the same time defiling the altars, which they had maintained during their life-time.—V. 6. The Keri בְּחַרְבֹתֵיהֶם, *with their swords*, does not convey any meaning, although the Masora and the earlier Jewish expositors have taken the same view of the word. In the versions only is the general sense of the passage given. The sole reason for dividing the word into two seems to have

been, that the last part was thought to be בתיהם *their houses.* The correct pointing is בְּחַרְבֹתֵיהֶם *in their ruins* (cf. Ps. cix. 10). This verse must be taken in close connection with the next, וינתץ introducing the continuation of the unfinished sentence: *and in the cities of Manasseh . . . as far as to Naphtali,* (yet not exactly in the cities, for the land had been full of ruins since the time of Shalmanezer, but) *in their ruins, he destroyed the altars,* &c. *Simeon* is named here along with the northern tribes, as in chap. xv. 9.—לְהֵדַק, the perfect after *lamed,* where we should expect the infinitive; the perfect is chosen here because in that case the two verbs כתת הדק could be written side by side: *he broke, he crumbled,* that is, he broke crumbling or so as to crumble; the *lamed* is affixed according to later usage to point out more definitely the relation of the two perfects to each other.

Vv. 8—18. *Restoration of the temple and discovery of the book of the covenant.* Compare 2 Kings xxii. 3—9.

Vv. 19—28. *Deputation to Huldah the prophetess, and her address.* Compare 2 Kings xxii. 11—20.

Vv. 29--32. *Conclusion of the covenant.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 1—3.

V. 33. *Introduction of the worship of Jehovah into all the lands of Israel.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 5—20.

(For Vv. 8—33 see the commentary on Kings).

Chap. xxxv. 1—19. *Description of the passover in Josiah's eighteenth year.* A tolerably exact translation of this section, though somewhat free in certain places, is to be found in the third Book of Ezra (in *Tischendorf's* edition of the Septuagint the first Book of Ezra) chap. i. 1—22 (compare 2 Kings xxiii. 21).—The description of the passover in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxxix. 13—27) contains by no means so exact an account of the proceedings connected with the festival, as we find in the verses before us, which are of peculiar importance, since they give us a more complete picture of this festival than even the laws and regulations contained in the Pentateuch.—V. 1. The time prescribed by the law was adhered to; see on the other hand chap. xxx. 2, 13.—V. 2. *According to their watches,* arranged according to their classes (cf. chap. vii. 6); in 3 Ezra we find κατ'

ἐφημερίας. *And he strengthened them for the service of the house of Jehovah*, by words of encouragement and by instructions with reference to the duties which devolved upon them, according to the precepts of the book of the law; compare the edict of Hezekiah, chap. xxix. 5 sqq. See also Neh. ii. 18. The Kethib is המבונים, a word not met with anywhere else; the Keri הַמְּבִינִים is found in many MSS. and ancient editions as the Kethib, and is also confirmed by testimony of an early date. *Who taught all Israel;* compare Neh. viii. 9 and 7, where they are referred to as those who teach the people the law; the same expression is used in 2 Chr. xvii. 8, 9, with reference to the time of Jehoshaphat. *Those who were holy to Jehovah;* not they alone, but the priests also were holy to Jehovah (cf. chap. xxiii. 6); here, however, the holiness of the Levites is mentioned on account of the command to bring the ark of the covenant into the temple, and none but holy persons were suffered to approach it. The command, "*put the ark of the covenant into the house, &c.*," cannot be made to mean, leave it on the spot where it has hitherto been standing. On the contrary, we must suppose that on the celebration of the passover the Levites carried the ark of the covenant upon their shoulders under the impression that they were required to do so by the law, and that Josiah pointed out to them the alteration, which had taken place in this respect since the erection of the temple by Solomon; they were to be bearers of the ark no longer, all that they had to do was to put it in its place and find other duties to perform. On the question, whether the ark of the covenant was still in existence in the time of Josiah, see *Hitzig* on Jer. iii. 16 and *Thenius* on Kings. Its existence is presupposed in this passage, and neither in Jer. iii. 16 nor in any other place is it stated that it was destroyed in the time of Manasseh. *There is no burden upon your shoulders;* cf. 1 Chr. xv. 22. *Serve Jehovah, &c.* (since ye no longer need to carry the ark of the covenant) in the manner indicated in vv. 4—6.—V. 4. *And prepare yourselves after your fathers'-houses, according to your divisions;* that is in such a manner that those who belonged to the same fathers'-house should stand together in the same division; see v. 5. *By the writing of David* (cf. 1 Chr. xxviii. 19) and *the writing of Solomon* we are probably to understand writings, in which the injunctions of David and Solomon

were described at length. The translators of the *Vulgate* and some modern expositors suppose that reference is made to precepts, or plans of David and Solomon, but in that case we should find a similar expression to that in chap. xxix. 25, "according to the command of David."—V. 5. The versions do not follow the words of the text very closely, hence it is impossible to detect any errors by their means. The sense must be as follows: *and stand in the sanctuary, for the separate companies of the fathers'-houses of your brethren, the men of the people, a portion of a fathers'-house of the Levites*, that is to say, in such a manner, that for every fathers'-house of the laity there should be only a portion of a fathers'-house of the Levites, cf. v. 12. But this meaning cannot be found in the words without erasing the ו before חלקת, which we need not hesitate to do.—V. 6 *Kill the passover, and sanctify yourselves;* from this expression it is evident that there was a sanctification of the Levites, which took place after the animal was slain. It may have been performed when the blood was handed to the priests (chap. xxx. 16), and possibly it merely consisted in the fact that the Levites were required to wash themselves, before performing any further duties.—*And prepare* (the paschal lamb, v. 14) *for your brethren* (of the people) *proceeding according to the word of Jehovah by Moses.* On the slaying of the lambs by the Levites, see chap. xxx. 16—18.—V. 7. The thirty thousand lambs and kids were most likely for the poor or for the inhabitants of Jerusalem, in short for such as had brought no paschal lamb. לכל הנמצא for all the *laity* who were present, to be divided among them; for the paschal lambs and oxen were presented to the priests and Levites by the princes of the house of God and by the princes of the Levites. *Of the king's possession;* cf. chap. xxxi. 3, xxxii. 29.—V. 8. *And the princes of the king, they gave voluntarily to the people, to the priests and to the Levites;* the amount of their contribution is not mentioned here; but in chap. xxx. 24 the princes of the time of Hezekiah are said to have given a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep. In the third book of Ezra the princes are not mentioned among those who made presents. Of the three princes of the house of God (chap. xxxi. 13; 1 Chr. ix. 11) *Hilkiah* was the high priest (chap. xxxiv. 9), *Zechariah*, of the line of Eleazar, was probably "the second priest" (Jer. lii. 24; 2

Kings xxv. 18); and *Jehiel* was perhaps the head of the line of Ithamar, which we know to have been in existence after the captivity, Ezra viii. 2.—V. 9. It is worthy of remark, that *Conaniah* (*Kethib;* in the third book of Ezra we find the name Ἰεχονίας), *Shemaiah* and *Jozabad* are also mentioned in chap. xxxi. 12—15 as Levites of distinction in the time of Hezekiah. No doubt the same names occur at very different periods in the priestly and Levitical families, and therefore we need not be surprised to meet with the same names in the history of Josiah as in that of Hezekiah. At the same time the very frequent recurrence of certain names seems to give support to the conjecture, that some of them were not names of individuals but names of families or fathers'-houses, which were borne by the princes or chiefs for the time-being. Shemaiah and Nethaneel may perhaps be called brothers of Conaniah, merely because they were associated with him in office. For the *Pesachim* lambs and kids were presented by the king and by the princes of the priests and Levites (after the numbers mentioned in vv. 8, 9, 2600 and 5000, we cannot supply the words *lambs* and *kids* from v. 7), and also oxen, the purpose of which is not described (compare, however, v. 13).—V. 10. *So the service was prepared, i.e.*, as v. 16 clearly shows, the preparations were completed. The last clause refers to the command of Josiah in v. 4.—V. 11. *Then* (the Levites) *slew* the passover; this verse is a direct continuation of the preceding one. *And the priests sprinkled* (the blood of the paschal lambs, which they received) *from the hand of the Levites* (cf. chap. xxx. 16), *the Levites taking off the skins;* this they are said to have done in chap. xxx. 17; but there it was merely as an exception for all who were unclean.—V. 12. *Thereupon they took off the burnt-offering* (according to the context from the lambs, after the skin had been removed); the burnt-offering, therefore, can only mean such portions of the paschal lamb as were to be burned upon the altar of burnt-offering, no doubt the same parts as were cut off and burned in the case of sheep and goats, when they were offered as thank-offerings (Lev. iii. 6—17). As these portions were burned in precisely the same manner as the burnt-offerings (cf. Lev. i. 9, 17 with chap. iii. 11, 16), they might very well be called הָעֹלָה, so that this word is used here in the sense

of אִשֶּׁה, *e.g.* Lev. iii. 9. This explanation is confirmed by the words at the end of the present verse: "*and the same also with reference to the oxen.*" The oxen themselves, therefore, were not offered as burnt-offerings, but the parts appointed were cut off and burned, the rest of the flesh being cooked and eaten (v. 13). *To give them* (namely the portions cut off, which together made הָעֹלָה) *according to the divisions of the fathers'-houses to the sons of the people*, *i.e.*, to the laity *that they might offer to Jehovah* (הקריב means to offer, *e.g.*, the fat of the burnt-offerings, Lev. iii. 9, 14). We must suppose the following to have been the way in which this was done: all the sub-divisions of the different fathers'-houses came one after another to the altar in solemn procession, to bring to the priests the portions which had been cut off, and the priests laid these pieces upon the fire of the altar of burnt-offering.—V. 13. The flesh of the paschal lamb *they cooked at the fire*, *i.e.*, they roasted it, *according to the law* (Ex. xii. 7—9), which prescribes roasting for the paschal lamb alone, not for any other sacrifice. The *Kodashim* on the other hand (*i.e.* the oxen, cf. chap. xxix. 33) they cooked in *pots*, *kettles*, (1 Sam. ii. 14) *and* in *dishes*, in precisely the same manner as the flesh of the thank-offerings was accustomed to be cooked. From this it is evident, that the oxen were offered as thank-offerings along with the paschal lambs; hence the meal did not consist exclusively of the paschal lamb, but of the meat of the thank-offerings also, for the latter were required to be consumed on the day, on which they were offered, though the eating of them on the second day was not strictly prohibited (Lev. vii. 15—18).—V. 14. ואחר; as an adverb "*and afterward.*" They prepared it *for themselves and for the priests*; for the latter, however, merely because they were occupied with their official duties till night-time, and had no leisure to prepare it for themselves: החלבים are the pieces of fat taken from the oxen, which were also burned upon the altar, but were apparently not reckoned as part of the עולה.—V. 15. *And the singers the sons of Asaph were at their posts—and the doorkeepers at every door, they* (the singers and doorkeepers) *did not require to leave their service*; for their brethren the Levites made preparations for them and then brought them the flesh, so that they

were able to partake of it during their service and without leaving their posts.—V. 16. The emphasis is laid upon the words, "*according to the command of king Josiah.*" The expression "*all the service*" is more fully defined by the subordinate infinitives: in connection with *the preparing* (inf.) of the passover and *the offering* (inf.) of the burnt sacrifices. The עלות were the עולה and the חלבים, v. 14. There is no reference in these verses to burnt-offerings in the ordinary sense of the word. Hence there do not appear to have been any burnt-offerings presented at the passover except the continual burnt-offering, Num. xxviii. 4. The fat of the paschal lambs and of the thank-offerings must, therefore, have supplied sufficient fuel to keep up the fire on the altar of burnt offering.—V. 17. Prominence is here given to the fact that according to the law the passover was celebrated by the assembled Israelites, and immediately afterwards the feast of unleavened bread.—V. 18. In 2 Kings xxiii. 22 we find the expression "*from the time of the judges, who judged Israel;*" in the passage before us the time is fixed with greater exactness, viz. the end of the period of the judges; for Samuel was the last judge (1 Sam. vii. 15), and it is stated that there was no such passover "*from the days of Samuel the prophet.*"—*The inhabitants of the northern kingdom who were present;* the meaning of the historian is not that all Israel was present, for the greater part was in exile, but there were some of the inhabitants left behind, who came to Jerusalem to the feast of passover.—V. 19. *In the eighteenth year of his reign*, cf. chap. xxxiv. 8. *Thenius* attaches great importance to the statement found in the *Septuagint* at 2 Kings xxii. 3, to the effect that Josiah sent Shaphan to Hilkiah in the eighteenth year, in the eighth month. If this statement rests upon a historical basis, all the events narrated in 2 Chr. xxxiv. 8—xxxv. 19 must have happened in about the space of five months and a half. We should then have a proof that the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign was reckoned from the autumn (cf. chap. xxix. 3). The eighth month of the sacred year in the eighteenth year of his reign would be the *second* month of his eighteenth year, and the first month of the new year would be the *seventh* month.

Vv. 20—25. *The war with Necho.* Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 29 and 30 a., and 3 Ezra i. 23, 30.—V. 20. "All this" is more

closely defined by the clause which follows in apposition: "*after all this, that-Josiah-had-prepared-the-house.*"—*Necho king of Egypt* was the successor of Psammitichus, and the *Νεχαὼ δεύτερος* of Manetho. He was the fifth in the series of kings of the 26th dynasty (the Saitic). The place at which the decisive battle was fought is mentioned at the outset as serving to indicate at once the direction and destination of the army: "*to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates.*" In 2 Kings we find instead the words: "*he marched to the king of Assyria to the Euphrates* (this is the reading of the *Septuagint* in the present passage), whether with the intention of fighting or of assisting him the text does not enable us to determine with absolute certainty. The decision of this point rests upon the question, what king is referred to by the name of the king of Assyria, whether *Nabopolassar*, "who might be called *king of Assyria* as being the actual ruler of the old Assyrian monarchy" (*Thenius*), or *Sardanapalus*, the last king of the Assyrian empire? In modern times *v. Gumpach* (die Zeitrechnung der Bab. u. Assyr. p. 146—147) has pronounced it impossible that any other king than Sardanapalus can be intended. In this case the design of Necho must evidently have been to assist the king of Assyria, and oppose the Medes and Babylonians, for which purpose he marched to the countries of the Euphrates (this is the explanation given by *Josephus* Ant. x. 5, 1). But although we are obliged, as I think, to regard this as the design of the expedition, the king of Assyria mentioned in 2 Kings must still be Nabopolassar, for according to settled usage the rulers over the Syrian provinces are always called kings of Assyria. If Nabopolassar is intended, עלה על in 2 Kings must mean he *marched to fight against* (as for example 2 Kings xvii. 3), and this explanation is certainly more natural than the other: he marched to his assistance. *Josiah went out against him;* the battle was then fought in the plain of Kishon, from which we may conclude that Necho had brought his troops to Palestine by water, and landed them somewhere near *Akko* (cf. *Herodotus* 2. 159). אתה is an emphatic repetition of the suffix (cf. chap. xxviii. 10). בית מלחמתי would mean "*my warlike house,*" (1 Chr. xviii. 10, and xxviii. 3), which, however, would hardly denote the house which is at war with me or my hereditary foe (*Keil*). According to 3 Ezra i. 27 and *Josephus*,

the reading should be על פרת מלחמתי, *my war is on the Euphrates;* of the versions the *Vulgate* is the only one in which the word בית is adopted.—*And God has said that he will speed me;* the God, whom Josiah would not refuse to obey, therefore Israel's God, not an Egyptian God, as some modern writers infer from *Herodotus* ii. 158.—*Leave off from God;* do not resist his will. —V. 22. "*The words of Necho*" are changed into words of the prophet Jeremiah in 3 Ezra i. 26, from which we may infer, that the translator regarded the words of God, to which Necho appealed, as a prophecy of Jeremiah (we might call to mind Jer. xv. 7—9) of which Necho had heard. *In the plain of Megiddo;* according to *Herodotus* ii. 159 the battle was fought at Magdol, not far from Megiddo, cf. *Thenius.*—V. 23. *Take me away;* that is, according to v. 24, let me get down from the war-chariot; in chap. xviii. 33 Ahab says to his charioteer: *turn round and carry me away from the battle.*—V. 24. *The chariot of the second order;* here probably the king's second, ordinary chariot, in which the king could ride more comfortably than in the war-chariot, hence it is not exactly a chariot of the second rank as in Gen. xli. 43. *In the sepulchres of his fathers* (2 Kings, *in his sepulchre*); *Thenius* supposes, that it was in a chamber in the burial place of the kings which had lately been built by Manasseh, see chap. xxxiii. 20.—V. 25. And all the singing men and singing women spake *in their lamentations* (*i.e.*, in the lamentations, which they were accustomed to sing on certain days) *about Josiah* also, *and they made them* (namely such songs of lamentation) *a custom in Israel, and behold they are written in the lamentations* (a collection of dirges, which contained among others the psalm composed by Jeremiah on the death of Josiah). In this *Thenius, Keil,* and *Ewald* agree. That the historian does not refer to the canonical Book of Lamentations is evident from both the contents and style of that book.

Vv. 26, 27. *Conclusion.* Compare 2 xxiii. 28; 3 Ezra i. 31.

## 17. Chap. xxxvi. 1—4.

### JEHOAHAZ.

Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 30 b.—35; 3 Ezra i. 32—36.—V. 1. By the will of the people, *Jehoahaz*, who is also called Shallum, was chosen king in the room of his father, although he was not the first-born. "The people, who were anxious to exclude the elder son from the government, appear to have been aware what they had to expect from him." *Hitzig*, on Jer. xxii. 10—12.—V. 2. *He reigned three months;* it was probably on account of the shortness of his reign that he received the name of Shallum (Jer. xxii. 22), as he was called so after the other kings of this name who reigned in the northern kingdom, 2 Kings xv. 13.—V. 3. According to 3 Ezra מִמְּלֹךְ should be supplied before the words "in Jerusalem." In the verse before us it is stated that "*the king of Egypt removed him from the government in Jerusalem.*" The *Vulgate* alone renders the last words "*cum venisset in Jerusalem.*" In the other versions and in 3 Ezra it is not stated that the king of Egypt came to Jerusalem to depose Jehoahaz. According to the more precise account in 2 Kings, the Egyptian king stayed at *Riblah*, on the Orontes, after he had defeated Josiah; Jehoahaz came to him (whether he came willingly or was treacherously decoyed there we cannot tell), was taken prisoner in Riblah and led away as a prisoner to Egypt. Our history will be by no means at variance with this, if we supply ממלך in the text. *Keil* assumes that the king of Egypt came to Jerusalem, deposed Jehoahaz, and then took him away as a prisoner, and put him in chains in Riblah (see *Thenius*).—V. 4. Eliakim was the elder brother of Jehoahaz; the Egyptian king did not confirm Jehoahaz, who had been chosen king by the will of the people, no doubt because he expected a more ready submission from Eliakim, and a more thorough departure from the principles of Josiah's government.—"*And took him*" (2 Kings, "*and he came;*") the two statements amount to the

s me thing. In 2 Kings it is added "*and died there*," cf. Jer. xxii. 12. If we do not find the fact that Pharaoh Necho had been in Jerusalem recorded in our third verse, it is not improbable that he visited Jerusalem at this time for the purpose of making Jehoiakim king. But it is not of the city of Jerusalem that the capture is described in *Herodotus* ii. 159, for the great city of Kadytis is not Jerusalem, but *Gaza* (cf. *Hitzig*, Geschichte und Mythol. der Philistäer p. 95 sqq. and *Thenius* on Kings).

## 18. Chap. xxxvi. 5—8.

### JEHOIAKIM.

Compare 2 Kings xxiii. 36—xxiv. 7; 3 Ezra i. 37—41.— V. 6. *Nebuchadnezzar* is the name, which ordinarily occurs in the Chronicles, the Books of Kings, and some chapters of Jeremiah; but we also meet with Nebuchadrezzar here and there in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and even Nebuchadrezzor in the Kethib of Ezra ii. 1 and Jer. xlix. 28. The latter spelling corresponds to the Greek Ναβουκοδρόσορος in *Eusebius* and other authors, and bears a great resemblance to the inscriptions discovered by *Rawlinson*, though they have not been deciphered with complete certainty. *And he bound him with chains* (cf. chap. xxxiii. 11) *to lead him* (לְהֹלִיכוֹ) *to Babylon;* the reading must be retained though the *lamed* is not expressed in 3 Ezra, the *Septuagint*, and the *Vulgate*. Are we to gather from the infinitive with *lamed* that Nebuchadnessar did not carry out his intention of leading him away, or is the meaning of the passage rightly given in 3 Ezra, the *Vulgate* and the *Septuagint*, where it is rendered somewhat as follows: *he bound him with chains and led him away* (cf. Dan. i. 2)? These questions cannot be decided with certainty from the words of the text. *Movers* is of opinion that if Jehoiakim was not actually led away to Babylon, and if our historian had intended to say this, he would have expressed his meaning more clearly, and would probably have added that it happened on account of his sins. *Keil* writes to the same effect (p. 24).

And certainly if we compare the words of our historian in chap. xxxiii. 11, we shall be inclined to conclude that he purposely selected the infinitive with *lamed* because he did not intend to say that Jehoiakim was really led away to Babylon. Later writers, on the other hand, who were desirous of making this expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jehoiakim the commencement of the captivity, might easily interpret the passage before us as meaning that Jehoiakim was actually led away. There was nothing in the statement contained in 2 Kings xxiv. 6 to disconcert them, for it is easy to reconcile the fact of his being carried away with his death and burial near or in Jerusalem, if we suppose that he was taken prisoner or led away to Babylon, that he remained there in captivity, but subsequently obtained permission, as Manasseh had done before him, to return to Jerusalem, where he assumed the reins of government as a vassal of the Chaldaeans. In this manner the Septuagint combines together the removal to Babylon and the burial in Jerusalem; for in v. 6 of this chapter we find an account of the former, and the burial of Jehoiakim in the garden of Uzzah is mentioned in v. 8. In the same way we find in Dan. i. 2 a notice of the removal of Jehoiakim in the third year, or shortly after the third year of his reign, from which it necessarily follows that he afterwards returned to Jerusalem, since the author certainly did not intend to contradict the account contained in the Book of Kings and in the Chronicles, of Jehoiakim's eleven years' reign. But all that can be inferred from this is, that at a later period the word לְהֹלִיכוֹ was supposed to imply that Jehoiakim was really led away, as the *Vulgate* and 3 Ezra evidently assume, not that our historian intended this. In our opinion the verse before us refers to the same events as 2 Kings xxiv. 1, viz. to the first expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Palestine not long after the battle at Carchemish, which was followed by the defeat of Jehoiakim and his three years' servitude. The words "*he became his servant*" merely state that he became tributary to him, not that he was led away. In 2 Kings xvii. 3 they simply denote dependence or tributary subjection; and in chap. xxiv. 1 we cannot infer that they mean anything more from the words, "*then he turned and rebelled against him.*" These words do not imply (as *v. Gumpach* imagines), that after an imprison-

ment of three years in Babylon he returned and revolted; on the contrary, according to a fixed usage of speech, they state that, after being the servant of Nebuchadnezzar, he once more renounced his allegiance. There is no discrepancy, therefore, between the account before us and 2 Kings xxiv. 1; for, whilst it is stated here that Nebuchadnezzar set out to lead him away, the result of the expedition is more distinctly given in 2 Kings, viz. that Jehoiakim became subject to him. When did this happen? Certainly before the death of Nabopolassar, which occurred in the year 604, and after the battle at Carchemish, for Nebuchadnezzar could not possibly have undertaken his expedition to the land of Palestine and the neighbouring countries as far as the Egyptian frontier before the death of Pharoah Necho. Moreover, we learn from *Berosus* (in *Josephus contra Apion*, i. 19) that Nebuchadnezzar occupied the countries on this side of the Euphrates with his troops, as far as the Egyptian frontier, before the death of Nabopolassar, and that when he hurried back to Babylon with a few of his soldiers on receiving the tidings of his father's death, he delivered the prisoners belonging to those countries, among whom Jews are expressly named, into the charge of his friends, who were to bring them to Babylon. It is true that he is called *Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon*, both in this passage and in 2 Kings, but we cannot infer from this that the expedition did not take place till after the year 604, when Nebuchadnessar actually succeeded his father in the government, for "Nebuchadnezzar, the general, is called king by the Hebrew historians (also Jer. xxv. 1) the very first time they have occasion to mention his name" (*Hitzig* on Dan. i. 2), and similar anachronisms are by no means rare where titles are concerned. It is certainly very difficult to determine with greater precision the period in which this first expedition of Nebuchadnezzar occurred.—V. 7. *Of the vessels of the house of Jehovah Nebuchadnezzar carried* (some) *away to Babylon:* a similar account is given in Dan i. 2, where we find it stated that he had them taken into the treasury of his god; according to the passage before us he brought them into his (*i.e.* the royal) palace; cf. Dan. v. 2—3. *Hitzig* (on Dan. i. 2) says, "the statement contained in this verse probably rests upon a confusion of the names Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin." This is possible, at least we are not

in a position to determine more exactly the source from which it was taken. But it must be borne in mind, that our historian makes a distinction between *some vessels*, which were carried away in the time of Jehoiakim, and *the costly vessels of the house of Jehovah* mentioned in v. 10, and there is nothing at all improbable in the delivery of vessels by Jehoiakim, for when he became the servant of Nebuchadnezzar he must certainly have agreed to pay him tribute, and under such circumstances the Jewish kings were accustomed to have recourse to the treasures of the temple.—V. 8. *And his abominations, which he had committed*; this refers, not so much to his evil deeds (*e.g.* 2 Kings xxiv. 4) as to the idols which were made by his orders (cf. Jer. vii. 9, 10; Ezek. viii. 17), for the following words refer to his evil deeds: "*and that which was found in him*" (cf. chap. xix. 3). Jewish expositors have supposed that the latter words contain a reference to signs and figures, with which he had covered his body in honour of the idols.—Our historian passes quickly over the calamitous times of Jehoiakim; he merely intended to record the event, which gave to his reign the character of an epoch, viz. the subjugation of Jehoiakim by Nebuchadnezzar. Every thing that happened both before and after this subjugation he passes over. He does not even speak of his death and burial. As in the case of Ammon (chap. xxxiii. 21—25) the burial of Jehoiakim could very properly be left unnoticed in a history so intentionally brief as the present.

## 19. Chap. xxxvi. 9, 10.

### JEHOIACHIN.

Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 8—17; 3 Ezra i. 41—44.—V. 9. *Eight years*; this is the reading adopted in the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate*, and 3 Ezra. In 2 Kings we find *eighteen years*, both in the Hebrew text and many of the versions; a few MSS. have the same reading in this passage, and of the versions the Syriac, the Arabic, and many MSS. of the Septuagint. In 3 Ezra also many of the MSS. have *eighteen years*. *Thenius* says that *eight*

may have sprung from eighteen through a copyist's error. But we look upon *eight* as the original reading, as *Hitzig* also does in opposition to *Thenius*, who lays too little stress upon the introduction of his mother's name in 2 Kings xxiv. 12, 15, Jer. xxviii. 26, which is evidently intentional, and from which we conclude that she acted as guardian over the young king. (For the rest see the commentary on Kings.—Tr.)

## 20. Chap. xxxvi. 11—21.

### ZEDEKIAH.

Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 18—xxv. 21; Jer. lii.; 3 Ezra i. 44—55.—V. 13. cf. 2 Kings. xxiv. 20. *Who had made him swear by God;* in Ezek. xvii. 13 it is expressly stated, that Nebuchadnezzar administered to Zedekiah an oath of fealty, when he made him king, on which occasion he will naturally have made him call his God to witness. Hence by his rebellion Zedekiah broke the oath which he had sworn by Jehovah, and Jehovah punished him for his perjury. *Zedekiah* might be the subject of the verb "*hardened*," but according to Deut. ii. 30 the words should be interpreted thus: *God made him stiffnecked and hardened his heart*, so that in spite of the warnings of the prophets *he did not return to Jehovah the God of Israel.*—V. 14. The princes of the priests and the people are here charged with idolatry and the desecration of the temple, from which, however, it does not follow, that the historian referred exclusively to princes of the priests and to the people in the time of Zedekiah, who were not liable, so far as we can gather from the Book of Jeremiah, to the reproach of idolatry. He is rather intending to point out the criminality of the whole nation, especially in the time of Manasseh, evidently according to the representation given in Ezek. viii. (cf. *Hitzig*). The *princes of the priests* are referred to in Ezek. viii. 16 seq.—V. 15. *For he spared, &c.*; namely, inasmuch as he did not immediately inflict the punishment, but continued again and again to send his prophets to call to repent-

ance.—V. 17. The subject of all the verbs in this verse is Jehovah. *And God slew their youths in the sanctuary;* thus the temple, which the Israelites had polluted by idolatry, he for his part polluted by the blood, which he caused to be shed there (cf. chap. vii. 20.)—V. 21. *The word of Jehovah by Jeremiah* is the prophecy, according to which the supremacy of the Chaldaeans was to last seventy years, Jer. xxv. 11, 12; xxix. 10. The period, at which the captivity terminated, is mentioned in v. 20; the same period is indicated here in the following terms: *until the land had finished her years of rest, all the days of the desolation she rested, that seventy years might be fulfilled.* According to this passage the captivity lasted seventy years, as Jeremiah had foretold, that is to say, the captivity in the strictest sense of the term, for seventy years of desolation are spoken of here. The captivity is no doubt reckoned from the third year of Jehoiakim, just as in Dan. i. 1, viz. from the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in v. 6. But when it is said that the land was desolate for seventy years, the general statement of the prophet is taken as the measure of a chronological reckoning, which is not strictly in harmony with the historical records. The Sabbatical years terminated, according to our historian's representation, at the end of the captivity or in the year 536. Now if the seventy Sabbatical years had been celebrated according to the law laid down in Lev. xxv. 1—7, they would have spread over a period of 490 years, that is, if one were kept every seven years. Hence the year 1000 must be taken as the period at which the Sabbatical years ceased to be celebrated, that is to say, in the time of Solomon, or, as we cannot look for complete chronological accuracy, about the commencement of the monarchical period. This would be quite in harmony with chap. xxxv. 18, where the passover is said to have been celebrated according to the precepts of the law until the end of the period of the Judges.

Vv. 22, 23. Compare 3 Ezra ii. 1—5. In Ezra i. 1—3 these verses are repeated: "*That the word of Jehovah might be brought to an end,*" *i.e.*, that the period of time pointed out in that word might not be departed from; in 3 Ezra εἰς συντέλειαν. The royal will was proclaimed by means of heralds, and also by a written edict, just as in chap. xxx. 5, 6.—V. 23. Compare

Is. xlv. 1 sqq. After the expression, *of all his people*, we have here the word Jehovah, whilst in Ezra i. 3, and also in 3 Ezra, we find יְהִי (*may he be*) instead. The latter is certainly the original reading: *whoever he be among you of his whole nation, may his God be with him, and let him depart.* The sentence, which is broken off abruptly at this point, is continued in the Book of Ezra.

FINIS.